

POLITICAL ISSUES
(Muslim Occupied Lands)

This book is issued by

Hizb –ut- Tahrir

Dar ul-Ummah for

Printing, publication and distribution

P. O. Box 135190

Beirut – Lebanon

THIS IS A DRAFT COPY

Introduction

This book covers seven issues of the most important occupied Muslim countries, as it is the case at the end of the first quarter of 1425 Hijri year, about the mid of 2004 CE, ie 1/3/1425 AH – 21/5/2004 Ac. These countries are: Palestine, Kashmir, Chechnya, Afghanistan, Cyprus, South of Sudan and Iraq.

This is not a historical book about these countries, though it is not free of history. It is not also study of the geography of the mentioned countries, though it includes some of it.

It is a reminder to Muslims that their countries are slashed from their sides, rather from their heart and centre.

It is a reminder to Muslims that nations compete over them, not because they are few, rather because they were stricken by the wahan, which is love of the dunya and hate for akhirah. Otherwise, they count many.

It is a reminder to them that they became underneath the nations, after they were at their head. They became at the margins of the world events after they used to kick off and direct the events.

It is a message for them so that they remove away the darkness of the corrupt civilization of the West and its vile culture by the light of the shining and radiant civilization of Islam; for there would be no darkness wherever light exists.

Furthermore, this book is a cry sent to the hearing of Muslims that three arrows had caused the loss of their country:

The first arrow, which had the greatest portion in this loss, is the treason of the Muslim rulers, beside their loyalty to the infidel imperialists.

The second arrow is the silence of Muslims about accounting their rulers, challenging them and changing of them.

The last arrow, whose portion in this loss is the least, is the arrow of the open infidel enemy.

It is moreover, a call and appeal to Muslims so that they listen to the call of appeal sent by women, old and children, regarding the violation of honour and sanctities and regarding the various atrocities committed in the prisons.

It is a call to the blood so that it agitates in the veins, to the hearts so that they become full with rage; thus they become firmly resolved, have far-reaching aims, and their

souls yearn to a dunya of honourable life, and an akhirah of everlasting bounty.

It is a call to every one that has a heart or gives ear with full reflection so that he endeavours relentlessly to re-establish the **Khilafah Rashidah**, with keen resolution and strong will until Allah gives him victory or he perishes while working to achieve that. Any one that has such determination will succeed, by Allah's leave.

It is also a call for appointing the **Khaleefah Rashid** (guided khaleefah), so that Muslims fight under his leadership, and he protects them. Thus, he would then rescues the land and people before the situation worsens and becomes beyond repair.

Finally:

It is a loud cry from Muslim occupied lands to those who have heart:

O Mu'tassim! O Khaleefah!

But Allah is indeed All-Powerful and All Mighty.

(1)

PALESTINE

Palestine started as a jewel in Muslims' history since Allah (swt) linked it with His Holy Mosque (in Makkah) with one bond, when He (swt) carried His Messenger (saw) by night from the Holy Mosque to *Al-Masjid Al-Aqssaa*. Allah (swt) says:

سُبْحَانَ الَّذِي أَسْرَى بِعَبْدِهِ لَيْلًا مِنَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ إِلَى الْمَسْجِدِ الْأَقْصَى الَّذِي بَارَكْنَا
"حَوْلَهُ".

Glorified be He Who carried His servant by night from the Holy Mosque (al-masjid al-haraam) to the Far Distant Place of Worship (al-masjid al-aqssaa) the neighbourhood of which We have blessed. [TMQ 17: 1]

Thus, He (swt) made it a blessed land. He (swt) had tightened Muslims' hearts to the

capital of Palestine (*bayt ul-maqdis*) by making it their first *qiblah* (direction) of prayer before He directed them to their second *qiblah* (*al-ka'bah al-musharaffah*), sixteen months after the *hijrah*. This took place before Palestine came under the authority of Islam, when it was conquered by the second khaleefah, Omer b. al-Khattab (r.a) on 15 AH. He received it from Safroonius, where Omer gave him his famous pledge (*al-'uhdah al-Omeriyyah*) that included as one of its statements: (Jews must not live with them in it, meaning al-Quds), based on the Christians request there.

Palestine was a jewel in Muslims' history, before and after its conquest. It was a centre of power in Muslims' lands; whenever any aggression took place against it, this aggression would be challenged and destroyed, sooner or later. It was the graveyard of the crusaders and tartars, and it will be so as well to the Jews, the enemies of Allah, by His Will. There were decisive battles in Palestine against the crusaders and tartars, namely Hitteen (583AH- 1187AC), and Ayn Jaaloot (658AH-1260AC). These will also be followed by other decisive battles against Jews, by the Will of Allah, so as to restore Palestine to the land of Islam, pure and complete.

The issue of Palestine became internationally active in the modern age at the time of the Ottoman khaleefah, Abdul Hameed. This happened when the Jew political leaders endeavoured, in cooperation with the infidel states at that time, particularly Britain, to have a foothold in Palestine. They tried to exploit the financial problem in the Ottoman Khilafah state; so Hertzil, the Jew leader at that time, 1901, offered to pay funds in the Khilafah state budget in return for that. Khaleefah Abdul Hameed rejected the meeting with him, and gave his well-known statement to *sadr al-a'zam* (his prime minister) so as to pass it to Hertzil as an answer to his offer: (Advise Dr. Hertzil that he does not take serious steps in this regard; for I cannot concede one inch of the land of Palestine...It is not my own property...It is rather the property of the Islamic ummah. My people have struggled for the sake of this land and watered it with their blood...Let the Jews keep their millions...But if the Khilafah state was divided one day, then they can take Palestine for no price...However, while I am still alive, it would be easier for me to let the scissors work in my body than to see Palestine torn from the Khilafah state. This is a matter that I will not allow. I cannot agree to slice our bodies while we are still alive). His expectation, may Allah have mercy on him, had been realized. So, after the destruction of the Khilafah, puppet rulers in Muslim lands helped the Jews to occupy Palestine, even to dominate over lands other than Palestine.

Ambitions of the infidels full of malice against Islam continued since the crusaders occupation of *al-quds* was terminated and liberated from their filth in 27th Rajab 583AH, 2/10/1187AC. They continued to carry their hatred against Muslims and their lands, particularly Palestine. So, when they entered Palestine in 11/12/1917 in World War I, the English commander of the allies' army, General Allenbe, said: (Now, the crusader wars came to an end). Thus, he considered the Ottoman Khilafah continuation for the Muslims who defeated the crusaders before eight centuries. And the English-through their conquest of the Khilafah and occupation of Palestine- have brought the crusaders back to Muslims lands; and they thought they will remain there and never be defeated after that.

In the same year, in 2/11/1917, English gave a promise, which they named (Balfour), after the name of their foreign minister at that time. In that promise, Britain pledged to help Jews to occupy Palestine and create a state for them there.

By the end of World War I and after the elimination of the Khilafah state, the victorious states formed (the League of Nations), which in turn forced British mandatory authority over Palestine in 1922 so that Britain realizes Balfour promise to Jews.

Britain started to take measures that help Jews to immigrate to Palestine from every corner in the world; it started to train them and provide them with weapons. The United Nations organisation was created after World War II, where resolution number 181 was issued by the General Assembly of the UN in 29/10/1947. This resolution divided Palestine between its people and those who aggressed on it. Britain paved the way completely and then decided to hand over most of Palestine to the Jews and to establish a state for them. It generated a play for achieving that; where it created a formal war between the puppet Arab rulers, who were then seven, and the Jews, under the pretext of preventing the Jews from establishing their state. This meant to show at the end of the war that the Jews have defeated the seven Arab armies. Thus they gave to the Jews, stricken with humiliation and wretchedness, a glory of power and bravery, which never suited them. Palestine was rather given as a grant by the retreating agents, so that the Jews can declare after that they resisted a war waged by seven armies. It is the war that they called Independence war. Finally a state for them was declared in 15/5/1948.

The infidel states then accelerated their recognition of this ugly state. The major powers at that time, namely America, Russia, Britain and France competed with each regarding recognition. Later on the infidel, colonialist and influential states in the region, particularly Britain and America competed in drawing plans for the issue of Palestine, which they called later on (the crisis of the Middle East). All of these plans were laid down to serve the interests of these states through embracing the Jewish state and giving it a weight more than the weight of all other states in the region.

The infidel west has achieved many goals through their embrace of the Jewish state and planting it as a poisonous dagger in the heart of Muslim lands. These are some of these goals:

- 1) They created an alien body between the Muslims in the region, which hinders their continuity and distances their unity.
- 2) They preoccupied the region with struggle with Jews and made them forget their original struggle with the infidel west, which destroyed the Khilafah. Before Jews were helped to have a state in Palestine, struggle was between Muslims and the west. After Jews' occupation of Palestine, struggle was focused on this usurping entity, and it diminished with those who created this entity.

- 3) They got rid of the Jews problems in their own country, because Jews are distinguished for their corruption and perversion wherever they settled down. The American president, Benjamin Franklin, had taken notice of this matter when he gave a word in the foundation conference of the American constitution, in 1789, as advice for the American people. He said: (There is a great danger that threatens the United States of America, which is the threat of Jews. Wherever they settled down they degrade the ethical standard and decrease the standard of trading trust....They suck blood and blackmail wealth...I warn you gentlemen that if you did not drive away the Jews completely, then your children and grandchildren would curse you when you are in your graves..).

Thus the infidel west created this cancer body in the Muslim lands. After that, there was a violent international struggle over Palestine, between the states of the infidel west, particularly America, Britain and then Europe. This struggle extended from Palestine to include the whole region. This is because Palestine remained alive in the hearts of Muslims, and a centre of influence in the neighbouring Arabic countries. Rather, struggle expanded to reach the remaining Muslim lands.

After the division resolution of 1947 and establishing in 1948 the Jewish entity that occupied Palestine, the international resolutions continued with common criteria in all of them, which is the preservation of the Jewish entity and providing it with all means of power. This is regarding the Jewish side. As regarding the Arabs side, the resolutions came as human solution for the issue of the refugees, where they have to live, and their relationships with the countries they emigrated to. All of the resolutions set out of these two factors: the Jewish entity is an accomplished fact that cannot be touched; rather, every effort should be done to have Arab rulers recognition in it, and the human rights of Palestinians through solving the refugees issue, their settlement in the remaining part of Palestine or the Arab countries and their relationships with them.

If the 29/11/1947 resolution of division was the legal basis for the Jewish state, then its acceptance as a member in the United Nations in 28/3/1948 was the international legal authentication of the Jewish state.

Britain, which is known of its wicked political cunning, viewed the necessity of creating a secular and democratic state over all of Palestine, ie in Palestine occupied in 1948 and that which remained of it, namely the West Bank that was annexed to Jordan, and Gaza strip that was under the Egyptian administration. It wanted all of these parts to be one Palestinian state, based on democratic basis, similar to Lebanon. Thus, the authority in whole Palestine would be to the Jews, who would associate with them some Muslim and Christian ministers. This state that would be actually governed by the Jews becomes a member in the Arab league, and thus becomes accepted by the region. The English considered this

solution a guarantor for keeping Jews as effective factor in the region. However, if they were separated in one state for them only, then they will remain viewed by Muslims as enemy, and they will be destroyed as it happened with crusaders, sooner or later. Many of the Jew politicians were convinced of this view and they strived for it. Britain used to pave the way for this solution by concluding peace between Jews and Arab rulers in the region, who were mostly her agents. Then after concluding peace, the issue will be sorted out according to the mentioned plan.

However, the diplomatic representatives of America in the Middle East met together in Istanbul in 1950 under the chairmanship of George Maggie, who was then the foreign minister deputy for the Middle East affairs. After that meeting, America decided to use all of her weight in the region, and to address the hot issues, in separate of Britain and instead of her. These are some of the decisions taken in that meeting: (To encourage the United Nations for implementing the division of Palestine into two states, one is an Arab and the second is Jewish; and solving the issue of refugees). America started the course in this plan by convincing the Jew politicians that having a Jewish state is better for their survival in Palestine than to be integrated with others and thus disseminated in them, which finally brings Arabs authority in Palestine. However, the political influence of Britain on the first Jew politicians such as Ben Gourion, and the ambition of these Jews to dominate over whole of Palestine did not help America, at the beginning, to proceed effectively in her plan.

In 1959, at the end of Eisenhower administration, America forcefully adopted its plan with some detail. This can be summed in creating an entity for the Palestinians in West Bank and Gaza strip, making al-Quds international and solving the problem of the Palestinian refugees by returning a small part of them to the occupied Palestine under the authority of Israel and giving compensation for their majority beside their settlement outside Palestine. Abdul Nasser, the main American agent in the region was delegated to implement this plan. It was also delegated to the other American agent in Iraq, Addul Karim Qasim who called for creating the Palestinian republic and arming the people of Palestine to deliver their land. They made contact with the High Palestinian Commission and embraced it. King Sa'ud, who was also an American agent, was charged to make contact with king Hussein and impose pressure on him to proceed in this plan. The media started to call to this plan in a noticeable way. However, king Hussein did not accept the plan and opposed it based on recommendation from the English. America started to exercise pressure on Jordan. The Arab League called then for a meeting in Shtura, in Lebanon, in 1960, where, under great pressure, the Jordanian Prime Minister, Hazza' al-Majali, agreed to the American plan. This means he agreed upon creating a Palestinian entity in the West Bank. However, the agreement of Hazza' al-Majali did not materialize because he was murdered after that.

When Kennedy came to power in 1961, he sent his well-known letters to king Sa'ud of Saudi Arabia, Abdul Nasser, the Egyptian president, Abdul Karim

Qasim, the Iraqi president, Hussein, king of Jordan and Fuad Shihab, the Lebanese president. America undertook to finance the refugees' issue and solve the issue of river Jordan waters. An Arab summit was then held in Cairo in 10/6/1961. This summit increased pressure on Jordan to make it accept the view of a Palestinian state. On the evening of the summit day, the American Ambassador in Amman held a meeting with Bahjat Talhooni, the Jordanian Prime Minister to make him agree to the Palestinian entity. But king Hussein called upon Talhooni and threatened him, and thus he again foiled the American plan and frustrated the summit.

Thus, the American attempts continued for creating a Palestinian entity in West Bank and Gaza strip, besides establishing an international entity in al-Quds. All of these attempts failed because they were rejected by the English and king Hussein. This is because their plan was to establish one secular state in Palestine dominated by the Jews, which will enter into distinct relations with Jordan. After that the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) was created under the chairmanship of Ahmad Shuqairi and by the support of Jamal Abdul Nasser in the Arab Summit that was held in 1964. The aim of the PLO was to try to separate the West Bank from Jordan and create in it an independent Palestinian entity, besides an international entity in al-Quds and Bethlehem.

The British answer to these American plans and attempts came in 1964 and 1965, at the hands of the Tunisian president, Al-Habib Burqeebah, the old English agent. He called to create one secular entity in whole Palestine, which is based on sectarian balance, where the Jews naturally represent the majority in it. The Arab states were divided between these two plans: the American plan that calls to create Palestinian entity separate from Jordan and Israel, and the British plan-Burqaibah project-that calls for one secular entity, which depends on sectarian balance, on the model of Lebanese entity.

The Egyptian role, which represents the American policy in the Middle East, increased due to the rise of Abdul Nasser's influence, such that the English and their agents took the defence position. The Arab masses rejected the plan of Burqaibah, besides Nasser's campaign intensified against king Hussein and the British policies in the Middle East. This pushed Britain to arrange an Arab Israeli war in the region, where king Hussein would concede West Bank to the Jews so as to escape the pressure imposed upon him for establishing a Palestinian state on it. Thus, king Hussein provoked Abdul Nasser so as to associate him in the war and implicate him in it, because he was not prepared to engage in any war with Israel. King Hussein intended to give Nasser a great blow so as to reduce the American pressure imposed on him, which is represented in the rising power and popularity of Nasser. Some military operations were carried out against Israel before the war so that Israel takes these as a ploy to enter war. He provoked Nasser, who did not expect the size of the Israeli military attack against Egypt. So he closed Teeran straits before the Israeli shipping in the Red Sea and expelled the International Forces. Israel used this as an excuse and thus waged an extensive war against Egypt, Jordan and Syria in June 1967. It resulted in the fall of West Bank, Golan

Heights, Gaza strip and Sinai in the hands of the Jewish entity within six days. The Jew leaders presented themselves as victorious over three Arab armies, and ultimately showed Israel, in their view, as invincible. However, they are well aware that their victory was not due to their power; it was rather due to the defeatism and conspiracy of Arab rulers. This is clear in the lack of preparation for war by the Egyptian regime, the withdrawal of the Jordanian regime from the West Bank and its surrender to Jews, and the announcement made by the Syrian regime of the fall of Qunaitrah, which was behind the Syrian army lines that was still fighting in Golan; this led to its confusion and withdrawal.

This forged war was considered a great turning point in the Arab-Israeli struggle in the region and in the initiatives afterwards for its solution.

The talk before the war was about creating a Palestinian entity and an international Quds, but after it talk became about removing the effects of aggression. Matters froze up, and Israel managed to swallow West Bank, Gaza and Golan. Thus talks focused on the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967. Resolution number 242, known for play and manoeuvre in its wording was issued by the Security Council. It called upon Israel to withdraw from (territories) it occupied during the war. America started to concentrate on solving the relationship between Israel and Egypt, which is considered more urgent in her view. The Palestinian file was thus left aside, and America started to prepare for a new war to move the peace process and to cement her influence, which was shaken in her main basis in the region, namely Egypt, which received fatal blows in the war and it lost Sinai.

It was only after few years that America managed to ignite a limited war between Egypt and Syria on one side and Israel on the other. War of October 1973 was a tactical war that led to signing Camp David treaty between Egypt and Israel in 17/9/1978. This came after an introduction represented in the visit of the Egyptian president, Anwar Sadat to occupied Quds and delivering a speech in the Israeli Knesset in 1977.

After Egypt had signed Camp David treaty, Israel withdrew from Sinai and returned it back to Egypt; on condition it is stripped of weapons and has multi national forces under American leadership, so as to guarantee removal of Egypt from the battle. Thus, Israel was contained from the southern side, and on the other side, confidence was restored in her agent, Anwar Sadat, ruler of Egypt, who had lost his popularity before the Egyptian people.

After peace with Egypt was concluded, the American weight increased in the region, and her activity moved to the Northern front. America advised Israel to subdue Lebanon and throw PLO out of it. Thus, 1982 war took place, where Israel invaded Lebanon and forced Arafat to leave Lebanon to Tunisia, under the Israeli military pressure and the American diplomatic pressure. Before his departure, a delegate from the American Congress came to Beirut and divested from him an explicit recognition of the Jewish entity so that this becomes introduction to

concluding peace with the Jews. In 25/7/1982 Arafat signed what was known as Makloski document, in which Arafat said: (The PLO recognizes the right of existence to Israel). The American Congress member, Makloski read the document before the journalists in presence of Arafat. He said: (Yaser Arafat signed today on a written document, in his capacity as PLO chairman. The document states that PLO accepts all UN resolutions regarding the Palestinian issue). By Arafat signature on this document, he would have given up the English view regarding the one secular state that is built on sectarian balance in Palestine. He would then have made the first step towards the American plan that calls to creating a Palestinian state alongside the state of Israel.

The second step came in the National Palestinian Assembly held in Algeria in October 1988 and also before the UN meeting in Geneva in December 1988. Arafat gave speech in the two meetings that the idea of one Palestinian state on the land of whole historical Palestine has finished and that dream came to an end. He said he accepts creating a Palestinian state on the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967; and he declared the creation of the Palestinian state on paper.

King Hussein was obliged in the same year, in July 1988 to agree to the administrative and legal separation between Jordan and the West Bank, which was a sign of his acceptance to the creation of a Palestinian state on it.

Britain and Europe have agreed as well on the idea of creating a Palestinian state. Thus, the American plan got the upper hand over the British plan, whose mention dwindled and its influence weakened, except some heresy from Qaddafi, the ruler of Libya. He started at the beginning of the 21st century to talk about the old English plan as solution to the Palestinian issue, which is one state in Palestine for the Arabs and Jews. He, however added to it a new flavour by deriving a new name to this state, which is Isratin, ie it is derived from Israel and Filistin. Nobody took notice of his two novelties: the novelty of the name and the novelty of reviving the British plan after its death.

After the second Gulf war, America gathered all the sides in Madrid Peace Conference in 1991, and forced them to follow courses in accordance with the American solution. However, Britain undertook its last attempt to obstruct the American plans, in coordination with the leaders of Labour ruling party in Israel, namely Rabin and Perez. It managed to conclude Oslo accord in 1993 between PLO and Israel. This accord was an attempt from Britain and Europe to bypass the idea of Madrid conference, which America put as a basis for the solution after the second Gulf war in cooperation with the leaders of the Jewish entity and the leaders of PLO.

Arafat came to the West Bank and Gaza, based on this accord, and he was allowed to establish a Palestinian authority that has no real sovereignty that was rather to Israel. However, America managed to change this accord into time-consuming and complicated negotiations, controlled by America so as to guarantee there is no any solution except in accordance with the American standards.

On the other side, a meeting was held in Washington in 25/7/1994 between Hussein, king of Jordan and Rabin, the prime minister of Israel under the auspices of Clinton, the USA president. The meeting was concluded by Washington declaration that terminates the state of war between Israel and Jordan. Later on, Wadi Arabah agreement was signed, which officially finished the state of war between the two states.

Then the second Oslo accord, known as (Gaza –Jericho) came in 4/5/1994, followed by Wye River agreement in 23/10/1998, which both did not live, rather died before being born.

Clinton administration tried to conclude a comprehensive peace agreement between Arafat and Barak in 2000 in Camp David. This agreement was known as Camp David 2. Clinton intended to end his authority by completing this agreement. However, the public opinion in Israel and the public opinion amongst Palestinians were not ready to accept such comprehensive peace agreement. Therefore, the Aqsa uprising broke out in September 2000, and Israel started to commit daily massacres against the people of Palestine to impose on them surrender and concession of the remaining basics they stick to. Camp David 2 expired by the departure of Clinton at the end of his second term and the advent of Bush, the son, to power at the beginning of 2001.

Bush administration hesitates in interfering in the Palestinian issue

Since the start of Bush presidency, his administration did not give the same attention, which the previous USA administrations gave. Concern for the whole Israeli-Palestinian conflict took a slow departure. In February 2001, Bush administration abandoned Clinton's proposals and gave up mediation between Palestinians and Israelis. In February 2001, the spokesman of the state department, Richard Powcher said to the media correspondents: (The views and proposals that were discussed in the last few months were the proposals and views of president Clinton. Therefore, they are no more presidential proposals or the proposals of the USA after he left presidency). America gave Israel a free hand in killing, assassination and harassing the people of Palestine, whether those living in the areas subject to the Palestinian Authority or those living outside that. Bush started to send his people to the region in trips most of which are for public relations. In this process Mitchell report came, followed by the temporary ceasefire guaranteed by George Tenet. The matters continued through successive visitors till the events of 11/9/2001.

Events of 11 September put the Palestinian issue in the rear shelves

The 11 September attacks created priorities other than the Israeli-Palestinian struggle. This struggle became of low priority in the sight of Bush administration, where America prepared to wage new war on the Islamic world under the pretext of fighting terrorism. Israel used this opportunity, ie fighting against terrorism, to

reoccupy the areas, which were put under the PA administrative authority, such as Jericho, Jenin, city of Gaza and Arrabah; and it used excessive violence against the Palestinians. Israel used the tanks, helicopters and Israeli fighters for imposing its authority over these cities. The size of the barbaric crimes committed by Sharon became quite obvious; so America feared this might have effect on her preparations for aggression against Muslims (Afghanistan and then Iraq). Therefore, it wanted to calm down the situations, thus she showed again her interest in the region. She declared in October 2001 that which she called (Initiative of New Middle East). It aimed from that to win the support of the Arabs to America's war against terrorism.

Israel describes the Palestinian resistance with terrorism

Israel started to consider the Israeli-Palestinian struggle as struggle between Israel and terrorism. This is what Sharon said before the Knesset: "We must remember that Arafat is the one who gave legitimacy for hijacking aeroplanes before some decades". Israel was not alone in using the statement of (war against terrorism) for attacking Muslims. Rather, India and Russia did the same and they described the Muslims who fight for their independence as terrorists. As for Israel, it started to focus in the media, particularly for the American public opinion, that there is no difference between the qaa'idah and Palestinian resistance groups. Based on that, Israel waged a malicious war against the Palestinian resistance groups, and even against the Palestinian police who used to help the resistance. In 13 February 2002, The Israeli army carried out harsh military operation in Gaza strip. Ifraym Sene, an Israeli minister said the soldiers will remain in the Palestinian areas in Gaza for some days till they find the factories that make rockets, and the military forces will wage more attacks and for longer periods if shooting rockets continued.

The matter that distinguished the year of 2000 is the nature of Israeli violence and the siege imposed on the Palestinian lands under the name of fight against the Palestinian terrorism, in imitation to the American war declared against terrorism. That year was also distinguished with the open demand by America from the Palestinian Authority to find an alternative Palestinian leadership, which is closer to America and farther from Europe and Britain. This is because America noticed that the Palestinian leadership, particularly Arafat, started to evade compliance with America the way she likes, and that he resumed his original contact with Europe, particularly Britain. This annoyed America, which planned to rectify the situation so that the whole Palestinian Authority becomes cut off from Europe and tied to her only. This appeared clear in the statements issued by America and those issued by Europe, particularly Britain.

In 18 June 2002, the National Security Advisor of the USA, Condoliza Rice said in an interview published in San Jose Mercury News: "Sincerely, the Palestinian Authority that is corrupt and colluding with violence, is not the basis that allows progress towards the Palestinian state". One week after that, president Bush called for the removal of Arafat. However, statements given by Europe, particularly

Britain were different in content. During the eight industrial countries, G8 in 26/6/2002, the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair said, insisting “the matter returns to Palestinians regarding the selection of their leaders”. Jack Straw, the British Foreign Minister was more explicit where he said: “We deal with the leaders who were elected; and in case of the totalitarian regimes, we deal with leaders who were not elected. If president Arafat were elected by the Palestinian Authority we would deal with him”. Yaser Arafat responded to the American statements, so he dismissed some security officials and made some other changes. But this was not enough for the Americans who consider Arafat more favourite to the British and Europeans.

Struggle continued till 25/9/2002 when Tony Blair tried again to breathe life into the peace process. He said: “We are in need for a new conference regarding peace process in the Middle East, which is built on twofold principle that stipulates Israel, which is secure, and a realistic Palestinian state”. After that, in October 2002, Tony Blair started to allude to the double standard American policy towards Israel, Palestine and Iraq. He said in the Labour party conference in Blackpool: “What happens now in the Middle East is horrible and wrong. Palestinians live under humiliating, disgraceful and desperate conditions, and the Israelis are savagely killed. I agree that UN resolutions must be implemented here exactly as in Iraq. But they must be implemented not only on Israel, rather on all the parties”. This pushed America to verbally stimulate Bush thoughts under the name of the Road Map, which came in his speech in 24/6/2002 regarding the creation of a Palestinian state under certain conditions alongside Israel. This was followed by frequent visits of official Americans to the region. The visit of the general delegate, Anthony Zany, and that of the vice president, Dick Cheney came in this process. However, Israel continued to justify its barbaric policies in the occupied territories, considering the Palestinian resistance equivalent to terrorism.

America gave a blind eye regarding the crimes committed by Sharon, for they came under the same pretext Bush used to call (war against terrorism), and his statement (you are either with me or with terrorism). Therefore, Israel exploited this excuse and went to the extreme in its barbaric crimes against the towns, villages and refugee camps. Arrogance of Israel became quite conspicuous in a provocative way, considering itself joining America in her (war against terrorism). As regards the factors that made the Jewish entity exaggerate in its crimes under the pretext of fighting against terrorism, without taking any account of any challenge, they are:

Firstly: It is the wide support to the entity from the New Conservatives in Bush administration. Since Bush reached power and the New Conservatives joined his administration, some of them like Douglass Faith and Richard Pearl started to draw the political plans to the Likud. They laid down a political paper called: (A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm in 1996). The paper advised the Prime Minister at the time, Netanyahu to “to make a new start in the peace process”. It meant cancellation of the terms of Oslo accords of 1993, and restoring the right of Israel in the land by rejecting the principle of land in return of peace”.

The paper called Israel also to reoccupy the Palestinian territories and search for a substitute to Arafat, besides developing a new stronger relationship with the USA based on self-sufficiency and mutual interest. It seems Ihud Barak and Sharon used this political paper as a real road map for Israel. Later on, Eliot Abrahams, the head of Middle East Section in the (American) National Security Council, was charged with preparing the Road Map. Eliot has also played a great role in pushing Bush to accept Sharon plan of withdrawal. During some weeks of diplomacy, Condoliza Rice and Eliot played an effective role in supporting the view of Sharon for strengthening the future of the Jewish state.

Secondly: It is the PLO and Palestinian Authority mentality of concession. Jews have noticed they gained new concessions through their escalating crimes. The PLO conceded Palestine of 1948 and demanded of that of 1967. Then it demanded of the majority rather than all of Palestine of 1967. Thus it continued in giving concessions, to the point that which it considers nonnegotiable today changes tomorrow. The rerun of refugees (to their lands) that was considered red lines, not one red line, PA started to draw back from it indirectly, then explicitly. In 1/12/2003 the PA, shyly but publicly signed Geneva document. Abu Ammar sent to Geneva his security adviser Jibreel Rajjooob and state minister Qaddorah Faris together with a word given in the name of Abu Ammar, the head of the PA and chairman of the PLO, in the conference held for taking signatures on the document. This means the PLO officially accepted Geneva document. Thus, the refugees' right of return did not become nonnegotiable, and not a red line; it rather changed into yellow or green.

There is a third factor added to these two factors, which are the unlimited support to the Jewish state by the new Conservatives in the American administration and the continuous concessions given by the PLO and consequently by the PA. It is the disgraceful and shameful position taken by the Arab rulers. Egypt and Jordan have official agreements with Jews, besides open embassies with them. They have mutual visits and normal rather distinguished relations. There are other Arab states that have open roads to Jews under different names such as trading office, human office, economic or sports conferences, etc, like Qatar, Morocco and Oman. The country of least naturalization with the Jewish state is that which recognizes it practically but without an official announcement, so it negotiates with it and recognizes its entity. This means there is no any Arab country that considers Israel as an illegal entity that must be destroyed because of its occupation of Palestine and its various crimes that reached humans, trees and houses, and that we are in a real state of war with Jews till its occupying entity is eliminated and Palestine returns to Islam lands. Therefore, the Arab states, since the first summit they held in Cairo till the last one in Tunisia, they do not scratch rather than upset an enemy. The Saudi initiative in Beirut Summit recognized the Jewish entity and wasted Palestine, exactly the same as any other initiative presented by America or Europe for the support of Jews. Arab states are not against the Jewish state, and nor they are neutral. The rather effectively contribute in proposing initiatives for the interest of Jews there. They even help to rescue the Jewish state when it falls in any predicament. The shuttle visits of the head of Egyptian Intelligents

(mukhabarat), Omer Sulaiman to the Jewish enemy give witness to that.

Due to these factors, Jews persisted in their crimes in Palestine. However, because America planned aggression against Iraq and waited the right occasion, she found it necessary to prepare the atmosphere for improving her image internationally and regionally so as to cover up her crimes in the (planned) attack against Iraq. Within this context, the speech of Bush in 24/6/2002 came to present some ideas about the solution of the Middle East crisis through creating a state for the Palestinians, within certain conditions, alongside Israel. His ideas came under the name of the (Road Map). The media, particularly the American, continued to speak about the ideas of Bush in his Road Map, and that he is interested of the Middle East issue. Media reports about these ideas remained till Bush declared that the main stage of his attack against Iraq, which started in 19/3/2003, has ended in 30/4/2003. In that same date he officially announced about his Map in its final form, and handed it over in that date to the PA prime minister, Abu Mazin, and Israel's prime minister, Sharon.

On examining the objective of announcing the Road Map, we find the following aims:

Firstly: In reality, it was to pave the way before the attack against Iraq more than being a map to pave the way for solving the Palestinian issue. This is because the speech of Bush in 24/6/2002 that contained this map came in the period of preparation of war against Iraq. The talk about this map continued till the start of attack against Iraq in 19/3/2003. The American administration envoys continued talking in their trips to the region about Bush thoughts for solving the Palestinian issue through creating two neighbouring states in Palestine. This created a general atmosphere that the American administration thinks of imposing some kinds of pressure on the Jews so as to accept the existence of a state to the Palestinians beside them. The American administration expected the atmospheres resulting from this initiative would reduce the consequences of her aggression against Iraq.

Secondly: The agents of America became in an uncomfortable position. This is because America, which they support, commits an open and gross aggression against Iraq. The people knew them as agents to America, so they fell into a critical situation before the people. Therefore, America wanted to provide them with a gossip so as to propagate (the justice of America in the region) by saying: Look at America, where at the time she wages war against Iraq it imposes pressure on the Jews to accept a state for the people of Palestine.

Thirdly: Europe used to speak a lot about a solution for the crisis of the Middle east (Palestine and Israel), and that it is more urgent to solve this problem than to create a new crisis in Iraq. Thus, America wanted to prevent Europe from continuing the talk about finding a solution to the crisis of the Middle East by answering them that the Road Map is the solution for this crisis, and it is ready.

America succeeded in this manner to a certain extent. This is because the PA and

Arab rulers considered the Road Map as a victory, despite its iniquity, for it alluded to a state. However, the points that came in the stages of the Road Map make this state a name without substance.

As for Europe, it grabbed the plan, which thus became an international map for the four great parties: America, Europe, Russia and UN. Meetings were repeated for its study, and the envoys started their trips between the PA, Europe, UN and America.

Despite all of that, America was not serious concerning its implementation. She was completely busy with her aggression against the official regime in Iraq, and with the predicament, which the heroic resistance in Iraq put her in. So, America was preoccupied with a subject, which is more important to her than the Road Map. Therefore, she left the verbal discussion interact in the region about the Map; while the actual action was troops of American army and their allies moving to Iraq, in a warm war, which flares up again every time it cools a while.

As for Jews they realized the lack of seriousness of America regarding the implementation of the Road map, at least in the current term of Bush administration. This is because America is preoccupied with its dilemma in Iraq and she is in a year of elections. Therefore, they put fifteen reservations against the map, such that these reservations made of it not executable. They continued in committing their barbaric crimes under the name of fight against terrorism in Palestine. Despite that, talk continued about the map loud and low, but in vain, because it was in origin designed to achieve the well known saying (I hear roar without seeing grinding).

America became preoccupied in the dilemma in which she fell in Iraq. Her main concern became the protection of her soldiers from the resistance because of her occupation of Iraq. She left the subject of Palestine, militarily to Sharon, and politically to the interactions of the Road Map, though she knew it was born dead from the first moment. This situation continued till Sharon presented his plan from one side in April 2004.

Sharon concentrated in his plan on unilateral withdrawal from Gaza and made that his main concern. As a way of throwing dust in the eyes, the subject of withdrawal from Gaza was followed by insignificant one in the West bank (four insignificant settlements), besides effectively annexing the main settlements in the West Bank to the Jewish state. Thus, the withdrawal mentioned in the plan was from Gaza strip. So, Sharon managed to transfer the issue mainly to Gaza, following the Jews style in transferring the issue gradually from the whole to the part and then to part of the part. The issue at the beginning was the (stolen Palestine of 1948), which changed to the (West Bank and Gaza of 1967), and then it became (parts of the West bank and Gaza of 1967), where it finally became Gaza only. Mention of the four marginal settlements in West Bank can hardly be considered inclusion of the West Bank, as a whole, in the plan of Sharon.

Sharon paved the way for his plan (unilateral withdrawal from Gaza strip) by visiting Washington in April 2004. He got everything he wanted from Bush during this visit. The American president, George Bush expressed his support to the plan, which Sharon promotes. It requires unilateral withdrawal from Gaza strip and four unimportant settlements in the West Bank. Bush described the proposal of Sharon as 'historical and brave work'.

Bush said in a joint press conference with Sharon in Washington in 13/4/2004 that Palestinian refugees must be settled in the future Palestinian state, and not in Israel. As service to the Israeli position, he gave great concession, saying the facts on ground have changed regarding Israel's relinquishment of the Jewish settlements in West Bank.

Bush said after meeting Sharon in the White House: (If the parties decided to follow this plan (of Sharon), then this will open the way for progress, and put an end to one of the most complicated conflicts in the world).

The American president added: (This might also lead to establishing a viable, compliant and democratic Palestinian state).

Thus Bush settled the final solution issues, as they call, in accordance with the wishes of Sharon.

Sharon said, from his side his plan (will create a better reality concerning the state of Israel), and it can represent a basis for negotiations with Palestinians. The Israeli prime minister said in 22/4 in the Knesset (that the American support to the withdrawal plan from Gaza is considered unprecedented success. Since the time we announced (the creation of) our state, we did not receive support similar to that which president Bush expressed). He added that (the Palestinians realize that the written pledges (of Bush) are the severest blow levelled at them since the declaration of our independence) in 1948.

The Israeli prime minister added that he wanted to speed up building of the 'security wall' in the West Bank; and he reminded with the written pledges, which the Americans undertook during his last visit to the White House.

By Bush's agreement to the plan of Sharon, he confirms America's absence of seriousness regarding the implementation of the Road Map during the current term of Bush administration. This is because, despite play with words, the plan blows up the Map in many of its points. Had Bush been serious about his Map, he would have not agreed to Sharon plan, and would have not said after his meeting with Sharon in the White House: (If the parties decided to follow this plan (of Sharon), then this will open the way for progress, and put an end to one of the most complicated conflicts in the world). This means he abandoned his Map for solving the problem, and that which solves it is (Sharon initiative).

This does not mean the Road Map is better than Sharon plan, rather they are worse

of each other. Rather, this means Bush's proposal of the Road Map, for creating a state, ultimately in 2005, was a laugh in the face of the PA and Arab rulers, so as to tickle their emotions, where he knew they would accept any thing. When Bush announced his ideas about the Road Map, in his speech of 24/6/2002, and he announced it officially and handed it over to the PA and Israel in 30/4/2003, he was only concerned about the interest of America and her war against in Iraq, besides tickling the emotions of the PA and Arab rulers with honeysweet words. Then he wanted to mislead Europe that he achieved to them that which they can talk about, which is the solution of the Middle East crisis.

This lack of seriousness is confirmed by the hesitant position of the American administration concerning the barrier wall, which indicates collusion between Bush and his friend, Sharon in this issue. Therefore, no one in Israel dealt seriously with the Road Map, because Jews knew Bush was not serious enough regarding its implementation.

It seems the European countries felt they were misled and bypassed by the American administration through its adoption of Sharon plan. This is because Europe always insisted on a solution concluded by the concerned parties, under the umbrella of the quadrant committee that takes custody of peace in the Middle East. However, Europe that still dreams of an effective political role in the Middle East, under the name of the European Union found itself marginalized and abandoned, though it carries the economic burden of any solution imposed on the region. Therefore, the European foreign ministers announced they would endeavour to revive the Road Map through holding meetings with the four parties that support the map, which are the USA, UN, Russia and EU.

Brayan Koyn, the Irish foreign minister, whose country presides over the EU in its current term, confirmed after a meeting for the EU foreign ministers saying "the Road Map is the only political mechanism capable to achieve permanent peace in this region".

It seems, however, Europe tried to save as much as it could, so it returned to welcome with the plan of the Israeli prime minister for disengagement from Palestinians, during the last meeting of the quadrant committee (USA, Russia, UN and EU). It said that (it welcomes and supports this step that provides a rare opportunity in the effort for bringing peace in the Middle east). This statement indicates of some European submission to the American policy, so that Europe is not left behind alone and does not leave room open for America alone. Therefore, Europe accepted matters that disagree with the policy it already pronounced, and instead agreed to and even praised Sharon plan for disengagement from the Palestinians without negotiations, a matter that fundamentally disagrees with the Road Map.

This is different to the position of Britain that complies with the American policy, whatever it was, besides trying to obtain or defend some interests, at the same time it keeps good relations with the EU. This position is represented in the

statement of Blair after Bush declarations in 14/4/2004, in which he said: (The British prime minister, in his turn expressed his support to Sharon plans for unilateral disengagement with the Palestinians). Blair declared after that, in Washington, after his talks with Bush in 17/4/2004, saying: (The Road Map remains the basis for the peace negotiations, and Sharon plan is not considered bypass to it). This statement is an example of the English evasion and cunning, because despite the two plans, namely the Map and that of Sharon, associate in the evils they have, Sharon plan definitely bypasses the Road Map.

Sharon plan stipulates evacuation of four isolated Jewish settlements in West Bank and 21 settlements in Gaza strip, and the withdrawal of Israel from this region except 'line of Philadelphia', which is a line that extends along all the frontiers between Egypt and Israel. Israel also reserves its basic right of self-defence, including undertaking deterrent operations and reaction through using force against threats that might occur in the areas from which it will withdraw. This means Israel will not give to the Palestinians except that which Sharon proposed to them since he took power, ie 40% of the West Bank, besides rejecting any authority for them over water, air space or passages. This is in addition that the Palestinian (empire) must be demilitarised.

All of this comes from one side, without having any relation with the negotiations of the parties, as it came in the Road map. It does not also stipulate a state, whether it is a demilitarised state or a powerless state of administration, or any type as that mentioned in the Road Map.

It worth mentioning here that Sharon plan of withdrawal from Gaza is not something new. The Israeli leftists, particularly Shimon Perez, often called for that; and withdrawal from Gaza was one of its aims. This is because its demographic conditions make the situation in it more complicated than in West bank. Furthermore, withdrawal from Gaza does not dramatically affect the security aspect of the Jewish state. This is contrary to the situation in West Bank, whose width in some areas, such as Tulkarm and Qalqilyah, is not more than few kilometres. This does not guarantee the strategic depth; besides the Jewish entity, does not have, even by its occupation of the West Bank, the strategic depth that enables it to defend itself in case a land attack came from the eastern front, because of the large length and small width of that front. Therefore, the withdrawal operation from Gaza will not be painful and neither effective. It would rather bring many benefits to the entity. It would first get rid of about 1.3 million people living in Gaza, according to the official statistics. This comes at a time where Israel suffer of the demographic worry, and the continuous increase of the Arabs inside the green line, West Bank and Gaza. By the mentioned plan of withdrawal Jews get rid of the wasps nest as their politicians call Gaza strip. By keeping Philadelphia passage under its control, Israel will make of the strip a big prison for the Palestinians, where they cannot leave it without the Jewish prison guard.

This is in addition to the waters problem from which the strip suffers. Since the

mid eighties, the Israeli authorities dug artesian wells on the eastern borders of the strip with Negev after conducting wide exploration operations of underground water reservoirs and their trends underground. Since that time, Negev started to flourish while the quantities of underground water in the strip started to diminish, to the point that many of the artesian wells in the strip started to produce salt water due to its advance for replacing the fresh underground water. This is not a reversal operation; which means if Israel stopped in future to pump water to Negev, the water will still remain salt in the areas affected by saltiness, because the question is connected with ions and chemical processes. It is also known that municipality of Gaza city started, since the end of the eighties, to dig new water wells outside its borders, specifically in the Northern areas that belong to the municipalities of Jabalia and Bayt Lahia, to neutralize the salinity of its wells. The purpose of mentioning this information about the problem of water in Gaza is to link it to the secret appendices of Camp David treaty with Egypt. This treaty stipulated supplying Israel with the Nile water through the (peace canal). If we took in consideration that Gaza would not have any drop of fresh water by 2020, according to the predictions, then this would be suitable reason for building the (peace canal) to supply Sinai with Nile water, and extending that to Gaza strip and Israel, under the pretext of Gaza strip and provision of Palestinians with water.

It is necessary to mention here a significant subject that Bush often called for the change of the Palestinian leadership, claiming it is incapable to bring peace. He called for bringing an alternative leadership capable to take brave decisions that lead to peace in the Middle East. Therefore, the American administration exercised pressure on the PA to create position for a prime minister. This resulted in bringing Mahmoud Abbas whom Arafat quickly got rid of when he realized that he would try to dominate him in the PA by stripping him of his responsibilities, particularly that related to the security dossiers and structures. Abbas intended to assign these to Mohammad Dahlan, who was nominated to become interior minister in his government. Therefore, Arafat replaced Abbas with Qurai' so as to guarantee his loyalty to him.

Arafat did not honestly comply with American plans for the Middle East, and nor he was of her sincere people. He goes along with the English since the foundation PLO. After the decline of the British influence in the Middle East, the English advised him to comply with the American course. Therefore, he accepted a state in West Bank and Gaza after he used to call for a secular state in Palestine for all the religions of Muslims, Christians and Jews, in accordance with the British view, so as to facilitate the acceptance of Jews in the region and their control over it. However, his ties with Europe, particularly with Britain have never been broken. Thus, America was not sure of the results of his compliance with her. Therefore she announced the necessity of removing him as a leader to the Palestinians. And she called for bringing a Palestinian leadership that does not only go along with America but remains tied with Europe; it is rather tied to her alone. Jews followed America's course in this matter. Thus, the idea of founding a prime minister was an introduction to become the competent authority instead of Arafat. However, it seems there are international circumstances, particularly European, that prevented

America from effectively and fully changing him. She instead adopted decreasing his authorities gradually. Had she been serious in executing this matter currently, she would have done so; because the man is within the reach of the Jews, and it is not difficult to fabricate a suitable theatrical operation for his removal.

Anyhow, Europe still supports Arafat; and his relationship with it, particularly with Britain still remains; and the contacts of Europe with him still continues. The question that arises now is: Can Europe continue in his support, and can it oppose the wish of America if this wish became a serious decision? It is expected Europe would not be able to continue that till the end, if America decided to realize her mentioned desire. This is because there were many issues in which Europe opposed America, but when America took the decisive decision Europe retreated, particularly if Europe managed to reach an understanding with America that gave it some interest when it went along with her. Therefore, the European support to Arafat might dwindle if he became loser, and the gamble on him is also losing; besides taking his side does not realize its interests.

It is noticed that the question of changing the leadership became debatable, and the different (Palestinian) organizations rushed for solidarity with the symbol, besieged president. In the ocean of these events Israel assassins many people, kills humans and destroys trees and buildings. All of this takes place while the besieged president is within its reach without being touched. This reminds of the story of the disaster of June (1967) when the following statement was repeated: 'as long as the leader, the chief is safe, then the country is good; even if most of the country was occupied'.

O Muslims:

Palestine cannot be liberated from the filth of Jews by rulers who succumb to the enemy, and openly concede the sanctities of the ummah to them, all of this as price for retaining disgraceful thrones and crowns. Likewise, an impotent authority (PA) cannot liberate it. It is Omer who conquered Palestine; Salahuddin is the one who liberated it from the crusades; so it is in need of people like the descendants of Omer and Salahuddin to liberate it from the filth of Jews.

The issue of Palestine does not concern the people of Palestine or the Arabs alone. It is rather an Islamic issue. It is simply an issue of a land and an issue of Islamic sanctities robbed by the infidel Jews, with the support of the infidel superpowers: America and Britain, and with the help of the agent Muslim rulers. Palestine is an Islamic country; and it is the southern part of Sham area. Muslims conquered it with their blood; so hardly you can find an inch of it without having the dust of the horse of a mujahid, or blood drops of a shaheed. It is property of the whole Muslims; and it is duty upon them to offer their souls and lives for regaining it. Any concession of any inch of it is betrayal to Allah, His Messenger and the believers. Allah obliged jihad upon Muslims for liberating Palestine from the Jewish state, and for eliminating the Jewish entity from Palestine, besides removing the control of America and all infidel countries away from it.

This is the issue, and this is its reality. It has turned to become an international field of struggle between America and Britain during many past decades. It became one of the international issues after the downfall of the Ottoman state; and the infidel western countries undertook the responsibility of reshaping the region based on their perception.

People of Palestine were the food for this struggle during the past decades; and they still pay of their blood and souls the price of achieving goals that often serve the infidel colonialists.

The influence of America in the last decade of struggle in Palestine became the strongest in the region, not only on her agents, but also on the British agents who cannot confront her; and even if they confronted her they back off. The American mark dominated the plans presented for the solution of the Middle East crisis. It is noticed that America proposes the projects and plans, while the others take over these projects and plans trying to solve them in accordance with their interests or according to the level of struggle. As for the Arab rulers, they have no any role in that except implementation. The superpowers: Russia, Britain and France try to have a role through joining America in processing the American plans. Thus, America proposes the plans first, and then the other countries take them over and proceed with them. This is clear in terms of the Road Map, where America announced it, and these states adopted it. These states acknowledged that their role is to complete and facilitate the American role, rather than to be its alternative.

It is necessary to mention in this context the following:

The fact that America is superior internationally, that its influence is the strongest in the region, and that the other major powers could not shift her from the position of leading state.

That fact that Jews are the spoiled child of America, where she provides them with weapons, ammunition, funds and even with men who carry the two nationalities.

The fact that the people of PA and Arab rulers fall in line with the infidel colonialists in Europe and America.

All of these facts do not mean to succumb to America, and submit the capabilities and resources of the Muslim lands to her disposal, particularly the issue of Palestine, the pure and blessed land.

These also do not mean America is invincible and invulnerable. Rather, her men, despite their ample weapons and developed ammunition, are not people of bravery or challenge. Their failure to deliver themselves from their predicament in Afghanistan and Iraq is good evidence. They lost the reputation they had, in the battles of the heroine Faloojah. If this is the reality of America, how is then the reality of those who are inferior to America like Britain or those dependent on

America like the Jews?

O Muslims:

You are capable to destroy your enemy, and restore every occupied inch of Muslims lands. You are rather capable to conquer their land and spread goodness all over the world, and return back as lighthouse of the dunya and the best ummah brought forward to mankind.

You can achieve all of this; but the key for it is the establishment of the *Khilafah Rashidah*. Muslim land is the land of wealth and men. Furthermore, it is the land of the great ideology of Islam, which brings life to all nations and delivers them of oppression and tyranny, and of the haughtiness of America in the 21st century.

You are the pivot of this dunya; and your country is the theatre of attraction and competence between the infidel colonial powers, due to its strategic location and huge wealth that Allah bestowed on you. How do the infidels realize your wealth and your location and thus compete over you, while you close your eyes about the bounty and power He granted you?

Are not you the ones that made the conquests, and caused many nations leave their false religions and corrupt nationalism and thus become one single ummah, united and mobilized by Islam?

Are not you the ones that defeated the tartars during their prime of power; and you even brought some of their folks in the fold of Islam, where some of their descendants embrace Islam till today in the Northern part of Muslim land?

Are you not the ones that vanquished the crusaders after they established kingdoms and states in your land, but the sky and the earth spit them out, and they were driven away with disgrace and humiliation?

The *taghoots* of today: America and Britain and their followers are of the same kind as those who came in the past. Those could not stand for more than one battle, after which they were defeated and withdrew. Hitteen was the beginning of the collapse of the crusaders. Ayn Jaloot was the introduction for the fall down of tartars. These only need the same, just one battle that breaks their structure and their entity. Is there any one other than the *Khilafah* that starts this battle? We have seen others who had ample weapons, and huge armies; but they did not fight because of the iniquity of the deen and the dunya; so they sold their *akhirah* for trivial commodity of the dunya.

The *Khilafah* alone is the one capable to shift America and Britain from the international theatre, eliminate the domination of America over the international position, deliver the world from her evil, spread goodness all over the world and destroy the Jewish entity that occupies Palestine, the land of *Israa'* and *Mi'raaj*, and bring it all to the fold of Islamic lands.

All of this will be realized at your hands, O Muslims!

"وَأَنْتُمْ الْأَعْلَوْنَ وَاللَّهُ مَعَكُمْ وَلَنْ يَتَرَكُمُ أَعْمَالُكُمْ".

“And indeed, you are the uppermost, Allah is with you and He will never waste your deeds”. [TMQ 47: 35]

(2)

KASHMIR

India conducts its mad campaign against Kashmir, while repeating the tempo of terrorism and terrorists, so as to place thick cloud on the issue. It wants some people to think that Kashmir is one of the Hindus properties, and it is supposed to be under their rule in the first place. The reply of Muslims in Kashmir to the aggression of India against them is, in their view, considered rebellion against the Indian state, which has the right of destroying them. Thus, they want to give false portrayal of the issue. In reality, Kashmir is an Islamic land; rather the whole of India is an Islamic land, which Muslims conquered and enlightened after it lived in darkness. The authority of Islam continued in it till the middle of 19th century when Britain aggressed against India and committed massacres and violations that reached humans, trees and homes.

Kashmir is an Islamic land, which Muslims conquered and Islam entered towards the end of the first Hijri century. This came within the conquests of Sind and Hind at the hands of the Muslim General, Muhammad al-Qasim, which started in 94 AH (712AC). Islam then spread in it and the remaining parts of the Indian subcontinent in the time of the Abbasid Khaleefah, al-Mu'tasim, 218-225 AH (833-839 AC). The authority of Islam continued in it and the whole subcontinent, which is known today as India, Pakistan, Kashmir and Bangladesh.

British invaded the Indian subcontinent in 1819, where it was faced with strong resistance from the Muslims. The war continued with alternate success between the Islamic authority in the subcontinent and invading Britain with the help of some kufr forces of Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists and others. Britain could not achieve stability and control over it except after 27 years of vigorous wars with the Muslims, ie in 1846.

Britain managed after that to extend its authority over the region, and divided it into three parts: she directly ruled one of these parts, which represents 55% of the subcontinent, and Muslims are majority in it. It ruled the other part through governors of provinces that include Hindus and Muslims. These governors were appointed over 565 provinces of autonomy. The third part, which is Kashmir, it leased to a Hindu

feudist for 100 years, in accordance with a lease contract signed in (Amstar), and became known later on in the name of Amstar agreement. This agreement covers the period between 1846 and 1946.

Thus, Kashmir, the Islamic land became governed by Hindus in accordance with the mentioned lease agreement.

Kashmir is about 217,935 sq. km., surrounded by Pakistan, India, China and Afghanistan. Its population are 12 millions; 85% of them are Muslims, while the remaining 15% are of the other sects, like Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists. The Muslim conquerors called Kashmir the ceiling of the world or the garden of Allah on earth because of its good climate, abundant forests and sources and the existence in it of the highest (Himalayan) mountain peaks in the world. Kashmir is a country that is rich with its waters and rivers, for it has the rivers of Sind, Jilhim and Ginab. Its land is generally rises over the sea level by about (1200) m. It is crossed by the famous Silk Road, and it is the only link between China and Pakistan. In 1983, sapphire and ruby were discovered in it, a matter that increased India's obstinacy in the occupation and constant domination over Kashmir.

This is Kashmir that was occupied by Britain, the criminal and belligerent state. It usurped from its Muslim population and rented to a tyrant Hindu who was enemy to its people. They come now to say that Kashmir is property of state of India, and that the Muslims resistance against them is considered terrorism and aggression.

The Hindu Maharaja that governed Kashmir in accordance with the lease contract made with the English had used all types of tyranny and torture against Muslims to the point that one of his ministers resigned because of the horrible crimes committed by the rule of the Maharaja against the people of Kashmir. That minister declared the people of Kashmir are herded like cattle, and they are oppressed and suppressed without being listened to by any official. He added the government in Kashmir is completely isolated from the people. This is what the enemy say; so how is the fact itself?

The Hindu rule in Kashmir used to defile the Muslims sanctities such as the Glorious Quran and the mosques like it happened in 1931, when one of the Hindu security officers defiled the Glorious Quran that led to the breakout of the Muslims uprising there. The Muslims of Kashmir are known for their resolve and determination in truth. One of their wonderful marks of their firmness is the incident of 13/7/1931, which Muslims of Kashmir compare with the battle of Mu'tah. In that day, many Muslims of Kashmir met to announce their solidarity with a person called Abdul Qadir Khan who gave a speech in the Friday prayer against the decisions of the Hindu king, which were hostile to Muslims. A Hindu security officer stopped him from giving the speech and he was then thrown in the prison. During the solidarity meeting they held in the prison yard, the time of noon (zuhr) prayer came, so one of them read the azan (call for prayer). The Hindu security forces shot at him immediately and killed him. Another man stood up and continued in reading the azan, but he was shot and killed. His companions stood up to continue reading the azan one

after the other till 22 people were killed in this incident before the whole azan was read.

Though the agreement expired, the Hindu ruling continued by the support of the English, sometimes openly and sometimes secretly. In 1947 the English divided the Indian subcontinent, apart from Kashmir, into two states: India and Pakistan, in accordance with the population. However, the Hindu governor of Kashmir joined India against the will of the Muslim population. It worth mentioning that when Britain divided the Indian subcontinent between India and Pakistan, the British ministerial mission confirmed in its memorandum dated in 12/5/1946, which was directed to the governors of the 565 Indian provinces, that they have to abide by the wishes of their people regarding the decision of their provinces unification with one of the two states, India and Pakistan.

However, the unification of three provinces to Pakistan has been obstructed, which are Hayderabad, Jonagra and Kashmir. The reason of this obstruction is that the governors of provinces of Hayderabad and Jonagra were Muslims, while the majority of their population were Hindu, so they were annexed to India. However, the majority of Kashmir population were Muslims and its governor was Hindu, yet it was annexed to India as well. The bias of the English towards the Hindus is the factor that enabled India to annex the three provinces, particularly Kashmir, to it. This led to many wars between India and the Hindu ruling from one side, and Pakistan and Muslims of Kashmir from another side. Thus, India occupied two thirds of Kashmir (65%), while another part (30%) remained with the Pakistani side; China took over (5%) of Kashmir. This is the current situation of Kashmir.

At the beginning of the war, in 13/8/1948, the first resolution regarding Kashmir was issued by the Security Council, which decided ceasefire and formation of International Observation Force for the sake of the assurance of continuous ceasefire. This was followed by another resolution for the withdrawal of the Indian and Pakistani forces from Kashmir in preparation to conducting a referendum, in which the people of Kashmir decide their final future. In 5/1/1940 India and Pakistan accepted the resolution, however India rejected to withdraw. Then Jawaharlal Nehru decided in 1956 to annex the part of Kashmir controlled by the Indian army to India, and he lifted the Indian flag on top of the government offices, and considered it an indivisible part of India.

In 14/2/1957 another resolution was issued by the Security Council that confirm the necessity of the withdrawal of the Indian forces from the province. However, as usual, it ignored the resolution, in collusion with Britain. Then it started to study the styles and means that were used by the tyrants to attack Islam and Muslims, and to seduce them from their deen, so as to use these styles and means in Kashmir. Therefore, it sent in 1965 a delegation of experts to Spain so as to study the way Muslims were eliminated in Andalusia after the fall of Granada. India entrusted also its ambassador in Moscow to study the styles of eliminating the Islamic character used by the old Soviet Union against the Islamic presence there. Then the Indian authorities increased its cooperation with the Jewish state after it recognised it and

accepted its seizure of Palestine, and started to study the Jews plans they used in their massacres against Muslims. Their declarations have revealed this cooperation. Benjamin Shan, a member in the previous government of Shamir said: (India and Israel face a common danger, which is the Islamic fundamentalism in Palestine and Kashmir. We understood how to deal with the Arabs and Muslims, and in turn we are going to provide India with our experience in this field).

India persisted on using different styles in Kashmir so as to create there generations detached from their deen, or ignorant of the proper understanding of their Islam. This is because it believed it could remove Islam from Kashmir after some years. However, the results were far from what they wished. Muslims increase their attachment to Islam, and their loyalty to Islam strengthens after every vicious attack the Indian authorities wage against Muslims, whether the attack was through oppression, torture or any other devious styles of distortion and delusion.

India committed massacres in Kashmir in 1989 that resulted in the murder of 25 thousand shahid; then it followed these with other massacres in the following years. The broadcast of the committee of Kashmiri Muslims relief announced based on statistics obtained from UN sources, India media, International Media agencies and from Kashmiri sources that the Indian authorities in Kashmir committed, since January 1990 till December 1998, the following crimes:

63,275 shahid were murdered with gunshots.

775 people of politicians, ulema and imams of mosques were eliminated.

3,370 shahid were tortured to death.

81,161 people are locked in prisons without hearing in court.

This is in addition to incidents of violation of honour and sanctities, wounded and lost, which count in hundreds of thousands. The reports of International organisation are full of atrocities committed by India in Kashmir, like the report of International Amnesty issued in 6/2/1999.

This is a part of the oppression and torture committed by the Indian authorities in Kashmir. As regards the other styles of distortion and deception, the authorities embarked on discontinuation of Glorious Quran and Arabic language teaching in the state schools, besides introducing the Hindu language as compulsory language. Then they used the media for carrying out intense campaigns against the Islamic values of family and women dress. This was in addition to promotion of alcohols in Kashmir and the laws of mixed marriage between Muslims and Hindus, followed by the implementation of birth control plan through using surgical operations to the point that the province of Kashmir known of its Muslim majority had won the highest medal in birth control.

This is Kashmir that suffered and still suffers of the barbaric activities committed by the Indian army and police against Muslims there. Its issue looks more similar to that of Palestine. Hindus occupied Kashmir at the same period Jews occupied Palestine and established a state for them there. The rulers of Pakistan have neglected Kashmir in terms of its protection and liberation the same way the Arab rulers surrounding Palestine did to Palestine.

Pakistan remained for long period, from 1947, the year of division (of Indian subcontinent) and independence (of Pakistan), till 2003, to call for the implementation of the international resolutions and granting the people of Kashmir their right of self-determination. However, India continued to reject these resolutions the same Israel does. Then a change happened in the position of Pakistan at the beginning of 2004, where Pakistan abandoned the negotiations based on international resolutions and the right of self-determination, and accepted instead bilateral negotiations with India with need of internationalising the issue. It further accepted to give up Pakistan's conditions related to Kashmir's right of self-determination.

The reason behind the loss of Kashmir and abandoning the defence of its Muslims do not come from the weakness of Muslims in Pakistan. This is because they are capable to regain it from India easily. It is rather due to the fact that rulers of Pakistan are agents to America, which made them give to India continuous concessions regarding Kashmir. Ayyub Khan waged a war in 1965 because of Kashmir, but he surrendered to India three rivers that were Pakistan's share. As regards Yahya Khan and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, they lost in 1971 East Pakistan that became Bangladesh. At the time of Zia-ul-Haq, the Indians occupied the mounts of Siyanshin. At the time of Nawaz Sharif, the mujahisdoon and the Pakistani army were deprived of keeping Kargil heights in 1999 after Muslims were about to realize victory. However, in compliance with US orders, Nawaz Sharif gave his orders to the army and the fighters to withdraw. This was in support of Vajpayee, the Indian prime minister at that time, and creating heroic popularity for him before his opponents of the Congress party, on the account of Muslims blood.

Ultimately, and for the first time, giving the people of Kashmir the right of self-determination and their liberation from the authority of the Indians have been abandoned, in the time of Pervez Musharraf.

The issue of Kashmir has been seriously submitted for discussion since Musharraf's visit to America and his reception by Bush in Camp David in 24/6/2003, for that visit was a turning point regarding the political and military action towards Kashmir. Not a single ruler in Pakistan dared in the past to speak about a solution for Kashmir through negotiation with India, in order to divide it. It was rather quite clear in every political proposal about it before that all of Kashmir, which includes Azad Kashmir that is with Pakistan, and Jammu Kashmir that is with India, becomes all of it independent from India. India used to reject that and considered Jammu and Kashmir are part of it, as it came in the declaration of Nehru in 1956.

Musharraf explicitly announced in that visit his approved a Road Map to solve the issue of Kashmir, on the same model of Middle East. He added about his readiness to give important concessions for reaching a permanent solution about Kashmir. This proposal of concessions was given during discussions with American (congress) representatives in Washington in 26/6/2003, during that visit. He added by announcing that he will stand in the face of the Muslim 'extremists', ie the jihadi groups in Kashmir.

So, Pervez Musharraf called, in 11/8/2003 for negotiations to solve the disputes with India. The statements of Musharraf that emphasised his commitment to discussions with New Delhi came one day after a statement given by Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Indian prime minister, calling for the necessity of stopping the blood shed between the two countries.

The news agency of Reuters reported in 17/12/2003, after an interview with Musharraf “that he is ready to be brave and flexible regarding the peace efforts between the two nuclear neighbours. Musharraf displayed in the interview flexibility regarding Kashmir. He said that if we wanted to solve this problem, then the two sides need to speak to each other with flexibility, disregard for the declared positions and meeting in the midway”.

After that Musharraf went on issuing laws, one after the other, for preventing and harassing any opposition from the Muslims to the occupation of Kashmir by India. At the end he met Vajpayee in 5/1/2004, where the practical foundations for negotiation with India regarding Kashmir were laid down.

The close positions in negotiation between the two countries started to appear. Lal Krishna Advani, the Indian deputy prime minister said in 12/3/2004 that his country “is ready to take and give, in attempt to conclude peace with Pakistan regarding the area of Kashmir” under dispute.

Then Vajpayee said on Friday 18/4/2004, within a rare proposal to Pakistan, that dialogue is the only way to bring peace to Kashmir. Jamali rushed to welcome this call, saying that this represents ‘a positive development’. Zafarallah Jamali, the Pakistani prime minister, welcomed the proposal for holding talks regarding Kashmir, which was presented by the Indian Prime Minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Jamali informed the media correspondents in Islamabad, saying: “The position of Pakistan is still as it was. However, once the negotiations started....there will be flexibility from both sides”.

India and Pakistan had resumed in 16/2/2004 the dialogue that was disrupted between them when the tension reached its climax two years and half before. The delegates of the two countries conducted talks in Islamabad for the purpose of drawing an agenda and framework for negotiations, which will hopefully lead to settle the dispute between them over Kashmir, as being the main point in the dossier of differences.

The US endeavoured since some time to improve its relations with India. This came after the breakdown of the Soviet Union at the beginning of the nineties. After America completed the stage of containing China at that period, it started the stage of reducing (cut the size of) China. Since India has traditional enmity with China, besides it also has huge human resources and military capabilities, it was the best candidate to play this role. America understood the value of India for this role. It actually tried since the Independence of India in 1947 to have the influence in it. However, the English and The Congress party prevented that. Through a significant

development, America enhanced the level of her attempts in 1990, where she sent Robert Jits, one of the CIA officials, to India, but her attempts did not produce the desired success except after the advent of her agent, Vajpayee, in 1998. There was a talk inside the American circles about central or leading states in the various regions of the world, where the USA would promote them to lead the regions they exist in; and she recommended India to lead the region of South Asia.

Since the issue of Kashmir was a burden for India, and it was like a thorn in its side, America endeavoured to remove that pain from the side of India, so that its complete attention will be focused on its disengagement as a rival for China in the region. This is also to prevent the hot issue of Kashmir from having influence on the American war in Afghanistan.

Therefore, once the two states of India and Pakistan became under the influence of America, she endeavoured to create mutual understanding between them over Kashmir. She also changed her original view regarding the solution of the problem. She wanted at the beginning to internationalise the issue, but she now urges the both sides to solve it bilaterally. The current view of America regarding this solution is to divide Kashmir, where the liberated part of Kashmir will go to Pakistan, while that part which is under the authority of India will go to India. The parts of Kashmir occupied by India, which are of Muslim majority, will be given some form of autonomy, but stay under the authority of Indian government. Despite that Musharraf and Vajpayee (before the last Indian elections) were under the control of America, however there are some obstacles before this division plan, which are represented in some elements in the Pakistani army and some Hindu hard liners. The events of September 11 2001, allowed America to confront these obstacles head on. America's strategy was to force Pakistan to make several compromises over Kashmir. Consequently Pakistan made several concessions, which ultimately strengthened Vajpayee's position amongst the hard liners.

The concessions consisted of withdrawing support to the jihadi groups, closing down training camps, decreasing Pakistani troops from the LOC (Line of Control), and abandoning any support for the Kashmiri Muslims. Finally, the situation reached the point that Perevez Musharraf, the eminent agent of America and the prime enemy of Muslims in the region that he announced in his visit to America, as we mentioned above, about his approval of a Road Map to solve the issue of Kashmir, on the same model of the Road Map of the Middle East. This map would lead to direct negotiations with India regarding the study of the American solution. He said he would confront the (Extremist) Muslims, ie the jihadi groups in Kashmir and the Islamic parties and organisations in Pakistan.

America hoped these concessions would increase the popularity of Vajpayee and his party in the sight of the Indian electoral, particularly it used to support Vajpayee militarily and to prevent Pakistan from owning developed weapons (such as postponing the handover of the fighters deal despite Pakistan had paid its price) .It also entered into a treaty of strategic partnership, so that Vajpayee appears before the Indian Public as the cause of their military superiority over their opponent, Pakistan.

She also supported Vajpayee economically to create economic revival. She did all of that because it saw the strong support of the Congress party, and that JANATA is a coalition that cannot stand before the Congress without support.

However the vulnerable spot of JANATA came from this support, particularly the economic one. This is because USA gave plentiful economic support, discharged funds to the government of JANATA and pushed it to adopt the (privatisation). This policy created huge companies and economic revival according to the capitalist model, ie more concentration of the wealth. This policy however does not suit a country in which poverty prevails. Therefore, rich people, finance companies and factories increased in the cities, but the poor increased in poverty, particularly in the countryside and villages.

Another factor was added, which is the deep-rooted nature of the Congress party, and its political shrewdness that follows the British style. So, it challenged the hard line position of the religious JANATA through displaying the secularism of the Congress, which is not taking side with any particular religion. It also attacked the capitalist nature of privatisation through displaying the Congress leftist face, by calling for creation of projects, which the state takes charge of them and thus creates jobs for the labours and the poor. The Congress party then focused on the position of JANATA regarding Kashmir, where it showed its weakness before Pakistan. This is because the Congress party does not accept occupied Kashmir to be subject of negotiation, since Nehru annexed it by a declaration in 1956, and considered it an indivisible part of India.

Thus, the results of the general elections in 10/5/2004 came as a loss to the ruling party of JANATA (BJP) and victory to the Congress party that supports Britain. This led to blowing up of America's plan to solve the dispute over Kashmir through creation rapprochement between the two states. The loss of (BJP) had levelled a blow to the wider plan of America, which is putting India in the face of the growing power of China.

The victory of the Congress means India would strengthen its hold on Kashmir more than (BJP), as it came to surface after its victory. On 09/05/04 India's now national security adviser JN Dixit said, **"We will have a firmer policy on Kashmir ...There cannot be any territorial alienation of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir. There can be marginal adjustment along the Line of Control in Kashmir."** On 23/05/04, India's External Affairs Minister Natwar Singh said that **the bedrock of India's relations with Pakistan was the 1972 Simla Agreement and subsequent agreements and declarations between the two countries.** On 24/05/04, Musharraf responded to Natwar's remarks and said, **"If he (Natwar Singh) means that there will be no movement or a status quo decision, well I beg to totally differ with him. That is not the solution. If the Line of Control is to be made permanent and that is all, this is not the solution. If he means we will go by the Simla agreement, then I don't agree with him."**

Despite that the Congress party explained it wants friendly relation with America, as Natwar Singh said, **"it is in our interest, it is in their interest and the interest of**

the world community that relations between India and the US should be on a steady course and not episodic". However the security, defence and policy agenda paper written by Congress for its 2004 Manifesto states: “ **Sadly a great country like India has been reduced to having a subordinate relationship with the USA where the USA takes India for granted. This is the result of the BJP/NDA Government’s willingness to adjust the US priorities and policies without giving due attention to India’s own vital foreign policy and national security interests... The Congress will give the policy of non-alignment a new direction keeping in view political and economic changes that are taking place in our region and elsewhere.’** The Manifesto also calls for India’s foreign policy to be built on Nehru’s vision thus indicating a return to a pro-British foreign policy. It states ‘**The most important task of the Congress would be to retain for India freedom of options in conducting its foreign relations...This is the essence of India’s foreign policy on which Jawaharlal Nehru built a national consensus, a consensus that has been eroded during the tenure of the BJP-led NDA government.’**

All of this means that America will now have to reconsider her position with India. The option of using Pakistan to foment a new Kashmiri uprising to weaken the Congress party and her coalition partners may seem attractive in the short term. But given the strong feelings for the return of Islam and its peak, jihad, amongst the Muslims of Pakistan and Musharraf’s precarious position, it is unlikely that the US will risk such a policy. Worse for America, is that the Congress party has begun to restructure the armed forces, which enjoyed warm relations with the US military. Congress has already initiated a purge of pro-American officers. No doubt this will weaken America’s ability to gain influence inside the armed forces. Hence this leaves America with little option but to wait. Most likely it will be after the US elections before there is any firm movement on putting together a new policy for India. Under no circumstance America will easily abandon India after she penetrated it during the whole period of Vajpayee government. Thus, the issue of Kashmir will remain in the hands of the unbelievers, where they will shove it around according to their interests and influence.

How can we then put an end to these treacheries of Pakistan rulers against the mjahideen and Muslims of Kashmir?

The answer to this question is confined in the active work of the Muslims of Pakistan to throw away the government of Musharraf and establish an Islamic state in Pakistan that stands up for reclaiming Kashmir by jihad and by force. It also continues the struggle with India till it restores the entire of the Indian subcontinent to the authority of Islam as it was before for long time. This is not impossible with the presence of strong iman, resolve and determination to continue this course till the Muslims aim in liberating their country from the filth of the Hindus is realized. This is feasible, because Pakistan has a huge military force and nuclear power, which it can hint to it for liberating Kashmir, which the diplomatic means failed to achieve through a period of more than half a century.

O Muslims:

Indeed Kashmir is an Islamic land, as well as the entire of India. As the Islamic Khilafah had conquered it in the first hijri century, it can bring back again the authority of Islam to Kashmir and the entire Indian subcontinent. It can as well remove the oppression, tyranny and barbaric practices of the Hindus and their followers against Muslims. The Muslims in the subcontinent are capable to do so. Pakistan alone is capable to do so when a sincere ruler, a righteous *khaleefah* that governs it by the law of Allah, leads it and fight with it against the enemies of Allah. Pakistan has the resources necessary for the Khilafah *rashidah* that will regain the might of Muslims and deliver them from the disasters that fall on them day and night, not at the hands of the unbelievers only, but also at the hands of the puppet rulers, who squander the vigour of the army in fighting their own Muslim brothers everywhere, so as to protect the interests of America and the Hinds.

O people of Pakistan; you are capable to ignite again the torch of goodness, raise high the banner of *Khilafah*, the banner of *la ilaha illa Allah, Muhammadun Rasulullah*.

"مَنْ يَنْصُرُهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَقَوِيٌّ عَزِيزٌ وَلَيَنْصُرَنَّ اللَّهُ".

“Verily Allah will help those who help Him. Lo! Allah is Strong, Almighty.” [TMQ 22: 40]

(3)

CHECHNYA

Chechnya is part of the Caucasus region, and it is a mountainous area that is located between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. This region includes Ingush, Daghistan, North Ossetia and Chechnya. These countries fall in North of Caucasus. It also includes Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and parts of Turkey and Iran. These countries fall in South of Caucasus.

Both of north and south Caucasus are Islamic countries in which Islam came early. They were conquered even before both of Persian and Roman lands. The Muslims reached it in year 22 hijri, at the time of Omer b. al-Khattab (r.a), and the great sahabi Abu Dujanah took part in its conquest; besides Tiblisi, the capital of Georgia was conquered at the hand of the leader Habib b. Maslamah, at the time of Uthman (r.a)

Caucasus remained part of the lands of Islam at the time of the Umayyad and Abbasid Khilafah. However, the weakness that befell the Abbasid state after the fall of Baghdad at the hands of Tatars (Moguls) in 656 hijri led to the destruction of Islamic authority in Caucasus at the hands of Moguls. It is interesting that the Moguls who tortured the Muslims had embraced Islam at the hands of the defeated people of Caucasus. They then established an Islamic authority in the Caucasus in the 13th century BC and took Qazan, east of Moscow as capital for their authority. Their state strengthened and expanded towards the south, so it annexed the Caucasus regions. Its authority reached Siberia and Moscow itself, and became known as the Golden Kingdom because of the great of gold it gathered in its capital, and due to its great wealth and the grandeur of its status over its neighbour states at that time. However, the emergence of the Russian state, and the unification of its Orthodox Christian emirates under the leadership of Moscow led to the continuous conflict with the Tartaric Islamic state. This conflict ended after two centuries with the fall of the Tartaric state, destruction of its capital, Qazan, annihilating of its people and transforming them by force into Russians after eliminating their men and giving their women as wives to Russian men. Thus the Islamic presence in the centre of Russia was eliminated because their Muslim brothers in the south, in the centre of the state were negligent and did not come for their help. At that time the Ottoman state emerged and started to pass aid to the Muslims of Caucasus and look after them. It thus started to struggle with Russian state over the control over the Caucasus areas, which became frontier areas between two great states, which are Russia and the Ottoman state.

The Ottoman state managed to impose its authority over Caucasus except Azerbaijan, which seceded from its authority to that of the Safawi state in Iran in 1578. The Islamic rule continued in it till 1722, when Caesar of Russia, Peter the great attacked Caucasus and occupied a part of it. However, the Muslims drove the Russians out temporarily in 1753, but the war continued in ups and downs between the Muslims and Russians.

The people of Caucasus managed by the support of the Ottomans to stand in the face of the invading Russian armies for more than three centuries till the Ottoman state declined. After that the Russians managed to defeat the Islamic resistance and thus impose their authority over the Caucasus in the second half of the eighteenth century.

However, the resistance of the people of the Caucasus continued against the Russian Caesars despite the different barbaric styles used by the Russians, which varied between annihilation, imposing Christian religion on them, transfer/resettlement, torture, burning the forests and replacing the Arabic, Turkish and Persian languages with the Russian language.

The Chechnya resistance emerged as the strongest among the Caucasus resistance. Scholars/ulema and mujahidun emerged in this resistance and were capable to assume successful jihadi leadership to the Chechnya people, which made them offer great sacrifice and made sleepless the Russian Caesars that succeeded one other in power. Sheikh Mansur, the Chechnya was one of the prominent leaders of Chechnya resistance, where he led a fierce war against the Russian Caesars, from 1785 till 1794; and he used to call it the holy war. Mawlay Muhammad followed him, where he led a severe war against the Russian occupation from 1824 till 1832. Imam Shamil came after him and he engaged in continuous battles for thirty years against the Russians from 1832 till 1859.

The revolt against the Russians continued against the Russians under the leadership of Chechnya leaders such as Umadwueve, Tabi Adayeve movement, Zelmayeve movement and the movement of Chechen leader Ali Beg Hajji who was hanged by the Russians in Grozeney in 1878. The Russians did their utmost to prevent Chechens from jihad, so they directed them to dervish orders so as to discharge their energy in small mosques and circles of celebrating Allah's name. However, this did benefit the Russians, because all the sects in Chechnya stood together for fighting against the Russians, including the Sufis.

The resistance of the Muslims in Caucasus against the Russian army was very forceful that overburdened the Russians to the degree that Lenin interpreted the speedy defeats that befell the Russian army in World War I was due to the fatigue that befell the army throughout a war that flared vigorously in Caucasus for many centuries.

At the communist era, Stalin transferred at the end of World War II all the people of Chechnya from their country to Siberia and Kazakhstan. Half of the people of Chechnya, which count one million and two hundred thousands, died in exile. The people remained in exile till 1957, where they were allowed then to return back.

The maltreatment of the Russian communists to the Muslims of Chechnya increased more than it was at the time of the Caesars. They destroyed the mosques, banned the religious education, imposed the atheist communist thought over the people and exercised the worst torture to them.

Despite that, the people of Chechnya continued to feel strong due to their belief in their Lord, and superior by their deen, where the crimes of Communists only increased them in resolve and perseverance. Many of the Russian literary acknowledged that.

Buskin, Lirmentov and Tolstoy used to hold great admiration close to fright to these Muslims of Chechnya. The play of 'Hajj Murad' written by Tolstoy was only glorification for the bravery of Chechens and the love for liberation from the noose of the unbelievers. Hirzin enquired whether Chechens belong to special species of human race. During the period that Solgentsin spent in Golak Archipelago, which is a chain of Russian prisons, he met people from 150 races who were arrested there. He said the only people from among these who were not cave in were those from Chechnya.

After the fragmentation of the Soviet Union into fifteen republics in 1991, Caucasus was not one of these independent republics; it rather remained annexed to the republic of federal Russia. Chechens, under the leadership of Jawahir Dodayeye, announced an independent state for them in 1/11/1991. The Russian immediately refused to recognize it and fought against them without respite. Then the Russians invaded it in 1995, but they failed in that war and suffered heavy losses. Chechen state continued to struggle for having complete separation from Moscow. In 1999, Russians succeeded in occupying Chechnya and annulment of the announced state. They committed huge massacres and horrible torture in it; and there was no state in the world that stood to help the people of Chechnya or support them against the Russian barbarism that exceeded every limit.

Ana Politkofiskaya wrote a book about the crimes of the Russian army in Chechnya, under the title (The Russian shame). Ana Politkofiskaya is one of the most famous (women) journalist after the communist era, and she worked as correspondent to (Novaya Gazitta), ie the new magazine. She visited Chechnya many times since 1999, and reported in her book live scenes of the Russian crimes in The Chechen war. She recorded in this book the reality of the Chechen tragedy. "The capital, Grozny is full with wreckage, while hundreds of Chechen villages turned to become shelters for ghosts. There are collective graves, while half of the population live under miserable conditions in refugee camps in neighbouring Angutia". Ana Politkofiskaya provided a list that included war crimes committed in Chechnya, such as "collective deportation operations that resulted in deporting half of the people of Chechnya from their houses as well as the collective killing". Ana Politkofiskaya revealed about hanging 150 civil Chechen by the Russian forces without legal prosecution".

The non-governmental Memorial association that stands for defending the human rights accused the Russian authorities that they carry out in Chechnya methods similar to those used during the most repressive years of Stalin. In a press conference held in the headquarter of the International federal of human rights organisations, Lida Yosubuva, the coordinator of the Memorial organisation in the Chechen capital, Grozny, and Uleg Orlove, the office manager of the organisation of human rights

office in Moscow, they accused Russia of using methods that were used by the Stalinist political police in the thirties and forties. Yusobova said the Russian forces and their allied Chechen forces use the same methods of the Stalinist secret police by kidnapping, with steadily increase numbers, entire families to coerce the wanted people to surrender.

In 1999, the Russian forces stormed Chechnya again so as to resolve the Chechen issue for the advantage of Russia, after it was about to impose its independence. This was based on American-Russian mutual understanding that emanated from mutual understanding between Evanove and Albright. However, the Chechen, as it is expected from them and despite the losses they faced, did not yield; they rather continued struggle against the entire Russian military force, without showing cowardice.

After the events of 11/9/2001 and Bush declaration of 'war against terrorism', Butin tried to exploit the stage for the interest of Russia in Chechnya. So he called for global war against terrorism and tried as well to win an international recognition that the war in Chechnya is war against terrorism. He repeated such claim often; and the last time he used this was when he called the international community, in 6/2/2004 to fight against terrorism, which he described as "the evil of the 21st century". This was after the attack that took place in the underground metro in Moscow. This is despite that the past Russian minister of information; Boris Mironov drew the attention, in a talk to 'al-hayat', to the concurrence of the great explosion operations and the elections. He pointed out to the metro explosion operation as being 'a repeated version' of the explosion in the residential buildings that came before the presidential elections of 1999. The explosions at that time pushed the security dossier to the top of the priorities of the president, who pledged to restore security to the Russians and close the hot files in Chechnya and in the entire region of Caucasus.

However, Butin failed to make the war in Chechnya part of war against terrorism in the world, though he achieved partial success in that. This is not because America and Europe have a supportive stance towards Chechens; on contrary they want to exchange with Russia interests it concedes over the issue of Chechnya.

The American Stance:

The American Ambassador in Moscow, Alexander Vershbu stated in a talk he gave in 29/2/2004, saying: "The American stance remained fixed towards this file during the last few years. This stance is based on clearly defined elements, the most of which is the recognition of the unity of the Russian territories, but at the same time opposing the settlement of the conflict through force or terrorism. Washington acknowledged there is some link between this issue and the international terrorism. Besides we condemned the intervention of the 'qa'idah' in this struggle. The USA provided some assistance to Moscow in this subject through exchange of information to prevent the arrival of weapons and funds to the Chechens. However, we differ over the assessment of the Chechen issue, and believe the struggle there is not linked with terrorism only, for its roots are domestic. It results from separatist-political activity;

and cannot be solved except through the use of political means. We believe the efforts Moscow spent till now are not enough (approval of Chechen constitution and election of president of a republic). We also still condemn the violations of human rights by the federal forces and the apparatuses used by Ahmad Qadrove (the elected Chechen president)". And he said: "The issue of authority in the old Soviet space will represent the greater challenge before the Russian-American relations".

During the visit of Colin Powell, the American secretary of state, to Moscow in 26/1/2004, he expressed the worry of his country regarding "some of the aspects of the internal policy of Moscow in Chechnya, as well as the relations of Russia with its neighbours in the states of the independent confederation". He added, "that Washington respects the unity of the Russian territories", "but it equally observes the rights of the neighbours of Russia". It worth noticing that Powell gave these statements the moment he arrived to Moscow, coming from Georgia.

The American ambassador in Moscow, Alexander Veslu described the visit as of prime importance. He said Powell wants to discuss with the Russian side the issues related to the old Soviet republics, pointing out that one of the most important aims of the visit is to search for "points of agreement" between the Russian and American sides in the old Soviet space.

This shows the issue of Chechnya is not more than a commodity, which America gives in return to that Russia gives a blind eye about the American expansion in the Caucuses 'Georgia', central Asia and East Europe. The statement of Powell "that Washington respects the unity of the Russian territories", "but it equally observes the rights of the neighbours of Russia", is understand within this context. It is within this context as well comes the acknowledgement of the transitional Georgian president, Ninu Bordjanadza that Tbilis provided large facilitations to the Chechen resistance. Some sources close to the Kremlin considered the conditions ready for building the confidence between the Russian and Georgian sides after the visit of Bordjanadza to Moscow and her meeting with Vladimir Putin.

However, the declarations of the American ambassador in Moscow, Alexander Virshbu are nothing also but encouragement and intimidation to Moscow. On the one hand, he acknowledges the unity of the Russian territories, but on the other he does not consider the struggle in Chechnya linked to terrorism only; rather its roots are local, and it results from political- separatist activity.

Therefore, the Chechen issue is not more than a subject in which America exchanges with Russia regarding her interests in The Caucasus, central Asia and east Europe. If Russia yielded to the American designs, then the America would continue to support the ruthless killing of the Chechens. If Russia however declined to do so, then America would raise the files of human rights in Chechnya, and the right of the Chechens to self-determination. She would also change the Chechen issue into an international one, where it is discussed in the international meetings and organisations. She would as well encourage the new government of Georgia to provide assistance to the Chechens, support them and give them safe heaven against

the Russian forces.

The talk about (the exchange deal) is no more secret between America and Russia. When Russia waged a destructive barbaric war against Chechnya in August 1999, it concluded an exchange deal with America. New York Times published in 19/11/1999 that Igor Evnof, the Russian foreign minister handed unofficial letter to Medline Albright, the American secretary of state during their meeting in Turkey in 18/11/1999. This letter contains a proposal of a (deal) in which America overlooks the Russian military operations against the Chechens in return for the flexibility of the Russian envoy in the Security Council concerning the sanctions against Iraq and the silence of Russia over the extension of a pipeline that carries oil and gas from Azerbaijan to the Turkish port of Jihan on the Mediterranean sea.

The European Stance:

In principle, there is no difference between the European and American stance, for both give exchange over Chechnya in return for their special interests. Europe has interests related to expansion towards the east, within the frame of European Union, so it does not like to see Russian obstacles in this regard. Moreover, due to its weakness to face alone the America plans, it desires to have strategic cooperation with Russia. The previous French foreign minister, Dminique de Vilban called in Moscow on 23/1/2004 for building “true strategic partnership” between Russia and Europe in the subjects of security, foreign politics and defence.

The French minister suggested to specifically setting up “a permanent structural mechanism” in the field of security. This proposal came within a speech he gave about France, Russia and Europe before the students of the Russian institute for international relations, with his Russian equivalent Igor Evanov on his side.

De Vilban said: “we can set up a permanent structural mechanism specified for the study of the threats that face the European continent, particularly in the field of the spread of nuclear weapons and terrorism”. He also emphasised that France is “ready together with its European partners to ponder on the subject of strong cooperation with Russia in the field of foreign policy and European defence”. He also recommended “pondering on carrying out joint operations in the field of peace keeping”.

The two presidents of Russia and France, Vladimir Butin, and Jack Cherack emphasised, in 3/4/2004, the reciprocal trust between Moscow and Paris, at a time the EU expands to include states in central and east Europe that were mostly communist. During a brief visit to Russia, Cherack visited, in company with Butin, the military installations in Crasnoznaminsk in the suburbs of Moscow. The talks between them dealt mainly with the relations between Russia and the EU. Cherack said that the relations between the EU and Russia are prime factor for the balance and stability of the future. Butin, from his side said the EU is a fundamental partner to modern Russia. He confirmed the need to reach satisfactory solutions, where he points to the

expansion of the EU, which Moscow says it might affect its interests. Regarding the Chechen issue, Cherack said they discussed it within the frame of fight against terrorism. He however hoped that a political way-out to the issue can be reached.

The Russian president, Vladimir Putin had criticised, in 22/4/2004, the stance of the EU regarding Chechnya. He compared the call directed to Moscow for making dialogue with those whom he called “the Chechen terrorists” with the call made by Usama b. Laden, in which he called Europe to sit down on the table of negotiations. On the occasion of his inauguration together with Silvio Berlusconi, the Italian Prime Minister, one of the joint Russian-Italian projects in Libtsik, he said: “There are some people who always call upon us to make dialogue with those whom we consider as terrorists. Terrorist number 1, Usama b. Laden had sent a call to Europe, recommending in it to have negotiations, but that was rejected, according to my knowledge. I ask about the reason that made Europe reject such call as long as there are some people who try to send it to us”. Putin said he considers the fight against terrorism a fundamental issue in the relations of Russia with the EU. He pointed out that Moscow “will receive tomorrow Roman Brudi, the chairman of the European Legation; and it will be put for discussion with him the issues related to all the questions, including terrorism in Chechnya and the call sent by Bin Laden to Europe”.

In 23/4/2004, Roman Brudi said in a word he gave in Moscow: “Let us explain that the EU gives unconditional and complete support to the unity of the Russian territories. Further more, we both have a common issue, which is the need to fight against terrorism”. One day after conducting in Moscow talks with the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, regarding the expansion of the EU to reach the borders of Russia by 1/5/2004, Brudi added: “It is not possible to fight against terrorism by force only. Fight against terrorism makes our continuous adherence to the democratic values more important”. The old chairman of the European Legation, however emphasised that “the respect of human rights does not restrict the efficiency of fight against terrorism”.

Thus, under the conditions of the abandonment and collusion of the Muslim rulers, who did not find any thing to provide for the Chechens except the resolution of the OIC that was held in October last year, which considers the dispute in Chechnya “an internal Russian issue”. This is besides delivering an invitation to the enemy of Allah, the crusader disbeliever, and the butcher of Muslims, Vladimir Putin to attend the OIC summit that was held in Kuala Lumpur, where they gave him a reception of heroes. Under yielding their issue to exchange of interests between the countries that brag freedom, democracy and human rights, the Chechens do not find other than Allah to support them. The Chechens will remain with their old strategy that might become part of their brave nature, which is always to fight assuming there are no friends, for they used to do that always. When the Chechens were deported collectively from their lands, there was no one voice that protested against that. So, how long they will continue to fight alone?

When will the Muslims have a Khaleefah who gives a general call to arms and

dispatches the armies for their help, and for taking revenge to the old men, women and children, by levelling strikes that make the Russians forget the whispers of the Shaytan, and also bring Muslims back to the true might of Islam?

(4)

AFGHANISTAN

Afghanistan is distinguished as being a buffer state between some of the superpowers and regional powers in Central Asia. It is a buffer state between China and Indian subcontinent, besides it prevents Russians from reaching the warm waters of the Indian sea and Arab gulf.

At the time of the British colonization to India, Afghanistan was a real barrier between Russia of Caesars and the imperialist Britain, to the point that one of Afghanistan rulers portrayed it as a sheep that stands between the Russian bear and the British lion. In drawing the political borders of Afghanistan between Russia and Britain, it was noticed to annex to it the mount of Bamir and the strait of Wakhan (Khyber) as a way out for the British-Chinese-Russian struggle over the region. Thus, the map of Afghanistan from the northeast side looked like the neck of ooze, extending till China so as to separate Pakistan from Russia and its old satellite countries represented in Central Asia republics. Lord, Curzon, the deputy of the king of Britain in India used to call Afghanistan “Asia’s theatre of war”, due to the successive wars on its territories.

The nature of this sensitive geographic location of Afghanistan, and the fact that it is a state that has no outlets to the sea, made it a foothold, a passage and a gate for the invaders and conquerors of Asia. The Macedonian Alexander took it in the past a foothold for the Greek invasion to the east in 329 AC. Muslims conquered it and annexed it to Islam land in 654. Jinkizkhan, Turks, Indians and Persians took it as passage for their armies. In the modern history, the English, Russian Caesars and the Soviets knocked on its doors, and finally the Americans who realized its importance as being the siege gate of Russia and China through Central Asia. This is in addition to its importance as passage for the oil and gas pipelines from Central Asia across Afghanistan to Pakistan, and then to the huge ports, which it built on its coasts at Indian sea and Arab sea. The subject of oil, wherever it existed, is America’s centre of attention, where she endeavours to control it together with its lines.

The Afghani people, with all of its races of Bashtun, Tajik, Uzbek, and Hazara and

others are generally strongly devoted Muslims, who do not believe in other than Islam as a system for their daily matters and way of life.

In the nineteenth century Afghanistan fell prey to the British-Russian struggle. Britain engaged in three wars against Afghan people to control Afghanistan and then contain Russia. The first war was between 1839 and 1842, in which the British army was defeated badly. After this war, Abdul Brahman Khan followed neutral foreign policy between the Russian and British empires. The second war was between 1878 and 1880, in which the British were also defeated, and could not achieve their aims in terms of controlling Afghanistan. The third war was in 1919, which ended with signing the treaty of Rowalpendi by Britain and the Afghani king, Amanullah who consolidated the British political influence in Afghanistan.

When this king tried to take the Afghani country out of its Islamic civilization, and decided to ban the hijab (women head cover) and introduce the western norm of life to Afghanistan, an Islamic people's rebel broke out against him under the leadership of Habibullah, nicknamed as ibnusaqqa (son of the water carrier). The king was removed from power, and the Islamic norm was restored to Afghanistan. However, Britain that controlled Afghanistan militarily during the authority of Amanullah managed to kill the son of the water carrier (ibnusaqqa) by Nadir Shah, one of the previous military leaders who were allied to Amanullah. This man restructured the royal system that was allying with the English in Afghanistan.

In 1933 Zahir Shah, the son of Nadir Shah, assumed the power when he was only 19 years old. He continued in power as ally to the English for about forty years. During the fifties and sixties particularly he governed independent from Russia and Britain, by exploiting their conflicting interests. He managed to follow a policy alien to both of them; then he would go back again to the policy of the English. This continued till his cousin, Mohammad Dawud, who had leftist inclinations supportive to Russia, overthrew him in 1973.

During the long ruling of Zahir Shah, the Soviet Union managed to make some infiltrations in Afghanistan for its advantage, such as selling modern military equipment to the Afghani government in 1953 and providing assistance for forming an Afghani communist party in 1956 under the leadership of Mohammad Nur Taraqi. It also managed, in the last years of the authority of Zahir Shah, to incite some political unrests in Afghanistan, following the way of creating contradictions and class struggle, which communism used to follow.

After Mohammad Dawud assumed the power in 1973, Afghanistan went out of the grip of the English. The communists easily took power five years after that, where they swept away Mohammad Dawud who helped them in inserting communism to the country. They brought in his place Mohammad Nur Taraqi in 1978, who signed in the same year a treaty with the Soviet leader Brigrinev that allows the Soviet forces to enter Afghanistan. This incited the resentment of America and Britain. For the first time since many decades, this disturbed the delicate balance of international powers for the advantage of the Russians in a sensitive and considerably dangerous region.

In this stage, the role of America in the struggle against the Soviet Union over Afghanistan became noticeable. It arranged a coup against Mohammad Nur Taraji at the hands of a communist who is allied to the West, called Hafeezallah Amin. He had deceived the Russians by appearing as a communist when he was at the same time with contact with the CIA. He took power in 1979, killed Taraji and tortured the communists allying with the Soviets. The Russians responded to that vigorously by invading Afghanistan in 27 December of the same year. They killed Hafeezallah Amin and appointed a new communist government in Kabul under the leadership of Babrak Karmil whom they brought with them from Russia. A violent resistance broke out immediately, and it spread through the entire country. Emigrants started to flow out of the country, and fighters joined together in many militia groups. A new page of the Afghani history started where the jihad factor became noticeable in the fight against Communists. The soul of jihad spread strongly in all the countries of the Islamic world, against the aggressor, communist disbelievers.

America exploited this new situation in Afghanistan, and it intervened very heavily in it under the pretext of the Soviet invasion to the Afghani land, which disturbed the historical treaties with Britain. Those treaties did not allow the Russian forces in that region to cross the limits of the river of Amodarya (Jihun). The military and financial aid started to pour out to the Afghani Mujahidoon starting from 1980, where the American aid to the Mujahidoon reached 700 million dollar annually. This is besides Stinger rockets that started to reach to the Mujahidoon by the end of 1986, and which was the main cause of crippling the Soviet aviation and shooting down hundreds of Soviet fighters.

The purpose of America from this intervention was to benefit from this valuable historical opportunity and enter a region she did not tread before. She wanted to become ultimately face to face with each of Russia and China, and to hasten the overburden of the Soviet Union economically and thus overthrew it. She wanted to become a major player in countries that are of significant importance to the leading state in the world. This is because that region is full of far reaching important interests for America, particularly it is close to the regions of Central Asia, and the Caspian sea, which is rich with oil, gas and various riches.

Russia felt, seven years after its invasion to Afghanistan that it is in real dilemma. This is because the resistance started to cause massive losses to the Soviet forces; and the Russian economy started to drain out. The matters in Afghanistan started to develop against its advantage. Therefore, it tried to find a political way out of its dilemma; so through an unsuccessful attempt in 1987 it peacefully replaced Karamil with Nagibullah, where Karamil resigned and Nagibullah, who was the head of intelligence, took over. He started to call for policy of (national reconciliation) with the resistance groups, in preparation to the withdrawal of the Soviets from the country. However, this policy did not work as well, because the voracity of war increased, and the mujahidoon realized many victories against the Russians, and they shot down about 200 Soviet fighters.

The Soviets realised after this that they are going to be defeated. More than 15 thousand of their soldiers were killed. They became certain America will never stop its support to the mujahidoon. So, they were forced to withdraw from Afghanistan in 14/2/1989.

Fight continued between the mujahidoon and the government of Nagibullah, which the Soviets continued to support till 1992, when the capital, Kabul fell in the hands of the mujahidoon and the communist rule in Afghanistan completely ended.

Power was then assumed by Burhanuddin Rabbani, the leader of the Islamic association that was supported by the military militia of the association under the leadership of Ma'ud Shah. However, there was a problem that Rabbani and his group were Tajik who do not represent majority in Afghanistan. More important, they were not supported by Pakistan, which is their strong and main neighbour, and which supported the mujahidoon throughout the long years of war against the Soviets. Therefore, the Bushtun group led by Hikmatyar and dependent on Pakistan at that time, rejected to recognise the leadership of the Tajik to the government because the Bushtun tribes had claimed monopoly to the authority the whole centuries. An uninterrupted internal fight between the forces of Rabbani and Mas'ud from Tajik and the forces of Hikmatyar from the Bushtun, resulted. The victims of the sectarian fight between the two groups counted 25 thousands Afghani. During this fight, Iran and Tajikistan supported the group of Rabbani with funds, arms and political support in the international circles, while Pakistan embraced the group of Hikmatyar.

When Hikmatyar failed to settle the struggle with Rabbani for the advantage of Pakistan, the Pakistani government turned away from him, and started in 1994 to form a new Bushtuni group known as (Taliban). The Pakistani intelligence services undertook its preparation with the knowledge of the American intelligence services, as an alternate to Hikmatyar.

Taliban burst out strongly and quickly with support from Pakistan. It swept over the Afghani lands and towns, which fell to its authority one by one. Within two years only, Taliban managed to capture the capital, Kabul, where its forces entered the capital in 1996. It established in Afghanistan an Islamic emirate under the leadership of Mullah Mohammad Omer. It then brought down Rabbani government, whose forces fled to the northeast areas, neighbour to Tajikistan.

Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Emirates recognised the authority of Taliban. Thus, the matters were settled in Afghanistan for the advantage of America through the way of Pakistan, which is the main puppet state for America in the region, and which used to support Taliban directly and strongly.

However, fight did not stop north of Afghanistan between Taliban forces and the forces of Rabbani and Mas'ud, together with the Uzbek militia led by Abdul Rashid Dostum. Russia, Britain, Iran and India used to support the forces of Mas'ud, while Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, with American help; they supported the forces of Taleban.

Between 1996 and 1998 there were negotiations between officials from Taliban and American officials, related to the recognition of America of Taliban movement as an official government in Afghanistan and handing over the empty seat of Afghanistan in the UN to Taliban. There were other negotiations between Taliban movement and the American company (Yunocal) and the Saudi company (Delta) for concluding an agreement regarding a deal for transferring gas from Central Asia, through Afghanistan, to Pakistan and Indian Ocean. However, exploding the two American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 suspended the treaty that was signed in Ashgabat, the capital of Turkmenistan in 1997.

The relation of Taliban with the USA and Saudi Arabia was friendly and good. However, exploding the two embassies poisoned this relation. America, followed by Saudi Arabia, started to re-examine this relation. Taliban started negotiations with Saudi Arabia for the handover of Usamah b. Laden to it, because he was accused to be behind these explosions, so as to put an end to this issue. The attack of the American planes against Afghanistan in 1998 prevented the conclusion of the negotiations regarding the handover. Torqy al-Faisal, the head of the Saudi intelligence at that time, said in an interview with MBC TV channel: "Taliban authorities were ready at that time to handover Ben Laden to Saudi Arabia. There were negotiations concerning this matter, but the events of 1998 aborted the process".

After that operations ascribed to al-Qaidah increased. So, America started to look for new alternates for Afghanistan outside Taliban, which was considered patron to al-Qaidah organisation that America started to consider a terrorist group.

When the explosions of 11 September (2001) took place, the matters changed radically, and the view of America towards the Islamite people, which she used to cooperate with them in the past, has radically changed. She adopted the idea of fight against (terrorism) as a basis for the new American foreign policy of Bush administration.

America quickly resumed its relations with the group of Rabbani and Mas'ud, and brought Dustum, who was a political refugee and expelled to Turkey, back to Afghanistan. She supplied the forces of Mas'ud and Dustum with weapons and funds, and turned its back to Taliban. This coalition between these forces supported by America was called (North coalition). The American savage invasion to Afghanistan started after Pakistan stopped the support to Taliban, and allowed America to use its air space, water ports and land bases for the attack against Afghanistan. Taliban recorded at its last days a strong stance by freeing itself from the American and Pakistani influence. This emancipation was reflected in its refusal to the Pakistani pressures for executing the demands of America. It drove back the Pakistani government delegates that exercised strong pressures on them and did not yield to their demands. However, this stance came late after it was pushed in the corner.

America used the forces of the North coalition as land troops to the American army

and as human shield so as to reduce its losses. Thus, in 7/10/2001, the head of kufr, America and her ally, Britain waged a savage war against Muslims. She bombarded the Afghani cities: Kabul, Qandahar, Jalalabad and others with Tomahook rockets, bombers and various weapons. These rockets and bombers took off from the air space, waters and lands of Muslims, which the treacherous Muslim rulers, particularly Pakistan and Uzbekistan, allowed the aggressors to use. This continued for some weeks without interruption. The Muslims showed great courage, and extraordinary resolve in resisting the aggressors, with the simple weapons they had compared to the forces of aggression. However, the condensed barbaric attack of the aggressors, together with the treachery of the rulers neighbouring Afghanistan, led to the downfall of Afghanistan in the hands of America in 2001.

The number of the Afghani victims during quarter of the last century reached about two millions. This big number of victims was killed only in the period starting from the Russian invasion to Afghanistan in 1979 till the end of the American invasion to it in 2001. These huge Afghani sacrifices were unfortunately crowned with appointing Hamid Karzay, as a ruler puppet to America in Afghanistan.

Bonn Agreement that laid down the new Afghani constitution was signed in 6/12/2001. America obtained resolution number 1883 from the Security Council to support this document. The constitution that was mentioned in the document gave to America, under the guise of UN, a distinct role in deciding the internal and external affairs of the Afghani people, and supervision over every matter in Afghanistan. So, the document stipulated American presence in the formation of the constitutional committee, the formation of the civil servant committee, the activities and tasks of the government, any change related to the rules of proceedings of all the state departments, and supervision over the implementation of all the aspects of the document. This means America appointed herself as the actual ruler of the state, forever. This reveals the hidden intention of America that the purpose of the invasion was to control the Islamic region, rather than creating a liberal authority as she claims. In fact, her war that she waged under the name of fighting terrorism is not save an introduction to a crusader war against Islam and Muslims. She wants to consolidate her control over the Muslim lands and to eliminate Islam from their life as they did and still do in Afghanistan and Iraq, and it is recorded in their plan of (Great Middle East). It is a crusader war disclosed by the military, political and educational actions, which America pursues everywhere she stayed in Islamic lands. Bush, the son, had even disclosed this aim since the first days of the events of 11/9 (2001). This came in his speech in 16/9/2001, where he declared that his war against terrorism is a crusader war. This is despite his speech came four days only after the mentioned huge explosion event, which is a period not enough to complete an investigation of an incident that is one percent of this event. This reveals the plans hidden in the storerooms of the American politicians against Islam and Muslims.

Though he said, it is (a crusader war) to rally the enemies of Islam around him; it however rallied the Muslims to resist him. Thus, we see the resistance in Afghanistan intensifies to the point that the news reported those who disputed with each other in the past, like Taliban and Hikmatyar, the leader of the Islamic party; they fight

together against America.

The American forces, aided by the international forces of (ISAF) and the NATO leadership failed to extend the control of the occupation, even incompletely, except on the capital. The rest of the Afghani regions beyond the capital, Kabul remained a theatre for the military operations that did not cease any day since the American occupation of Afghanistan.

The mentioned Bonn agreement stipulated, in its last stage, to hold in Afghanistan presidential and parliament elections in June 2004. However, the gravity of the resistance against the American occupation forced the occupants and Karzay government to delay the presidential elections till September 2004, and the parliamentary elections till spring of 2005.

Previously, America succeeded in the first stage of the agreement to create a transitional government led by her agent, Karzai. She, as well succeeded in marginalizing the influence of Europe who favoured King Zahir Shah and his people to head the government.

It was reported by New York Times reported that America's envoys pressed the king to withdraw himself from the scene so that the Loya Jerga itself can chose a leader for the nation. So, before Zahir Shah could even make his own announcement, Zalmay Khalilzad (now US ambassador to Afghanistan) told the press: "The former king is not a candidate for a position in he transitional authority, and he endorses Karzai, the chairman of the council".

Then, on 3rd of January 2004, under UN auspices, America succeeded in coercing the Council of Afghani representatives (Loya Jirga) to pass a new secular constitution for Afghanistan. The constitution bestowed huge powers to the president and diluted the authorities given to the parliament, which at best could only veto appointment of ministers. The American ambassador in Afghanistan, Zalmay Khalilzad called it: "one of the most enlightened constitutions in the Islamic world". President Bush praised the outcome in a statement from Washington, saying that the new constitution "lays the foundations for democratic institutions" in Afghanistan. In this way, America charted a new secular course for the people of Afghanistan, and also legitimised Karzai and his transitional government. The last piece of the political plan is for Karzai to assume the office of the president, forms a new government through the elections of the last phase. However, the deteriorating security situation has sled to the postponement of the elections.

The fluctuating position of the resistance continued despite all the forces that America rallied, in terms of international forces, NATO and American forces, besides the assistance of the Pakistani forces. However, these forces could not have control over the security for holding the elections. Therefore, those who draw the American policy resorted to the political actions in attempt for preparing the security environment for elections.

Thus, Afghanistan witnessed wide diplomatic activities by the government of Karzay and the American there. One of these activities was calling Taliban to participate in the elections planned in next September, which were originally planned in June, but were postponed till September because of security fears.

These elections aim at giving legitimacy to the agent government of Karzay, and creating political stability in Afghanistan so as to conclude the American regional plans. However, Mullah Dadallah, who is a senior leader in Taliban, rushed in 25/4/2004 to reject the offer of Karzay, and repeated his threat to foil the presidential and parliamentary elections in Afghanistan. Karzay had mentioned before that his government conducts talks with the hard-line movement to end its bloody revolt.

This offer comes at a time where the resistance activities continue against the American occupation of Afghanistan and their agents of the Karzayi puppet government. There are daily explosions that cause sleeplessness to the disbeliever occupants and their henchmen. So, they looked for convincing more states to send their armies to help them in Afghanistan.

This explains the statement of Nicholas Pearn, the American ambassador at the NATO who said in 26/4/2004 that Spain, Turkey, Germany and other seven countries (which have no forces in Iraq) showed their readiness to participate with some forces in Afghanistan to enable NATO expand its role outside the Afghani capital, Kabul. He also announced that the forces of these countries could participate in preserving security during the Afghani elections, which are going to be held in September. This is based on the request of the Afghani president, Hameed Karzay, who is worried about the elections in the disturbed provinces (threatened by) non-controlled special militia organisations. Pearn said to the journalists aboard an airplane that carried general James Johns, the military director of NATO and ambassadors of 26 countries in the alliance to Kabul: “There are many governments that do not participate in Iraq or leave Iraq, like Spain, which have extra forces”.

BBC mentioned in 6/2/2004 “that the defence ministers of NATO agreed, in their meeting held in Munich, to increase the peace keeping force that follows to the alliance and is distributed in Afghanistan”.

Andrew Lizli, the deputy of the leader of NATO forces in Afghanistan, who finished his service term, said that ISAF forces must be supported to reach 12 thousands so as to be able to maintain security.

He added saying that the task of the NATO forces might continue for a period of ten years.

The American defence minister, Donald Rumsfeld, emphasised the current task must be executed with the highest possible efficiency before sending extra soldiers.

He said during his trip coming from Washington: “I think the prime job of the NATO must be the good performance in Afghanistan”.

The secretary of the NATO suggested working to strengthen the relations between the forces of ISAF and the American forces distributed in Afghanistan, which reach 12 thousands”.

However all of these efforts failed to weaken the resistance, militarily and politically. The result was that the resistance of Muslims, from Taliban, al-Qaidah and others has become stronger and harder; and the fight against the occupants as disbelievers has concentrated in the Afghans minds and increased in power.

This is Afghanistan; and this is the result of the war waged by America, Britain and their allies, from one side, and the resistance represented by Taliban as a state and a movement, Hikmatyar and the rest of Muslims. It deserves attention, particularly the rule of Taleban, the rule of North alliance, the rule of Karzay and the role of America and Pakistan. These events deserve contemplation due to their importance and for learning lessons from them. Thus, the Muslim becomes aware of his matter, and does not fall in the trap of the enemy and regrets when it is late.

The first lesson is the obligation of not cooperating with the foreign disbeliever, and nor have trust in him, whatsoever. This is because the disbelievers do not want any good for this ummah. They fight in the path of shaytan, conspire against the Islamic ummah and wait disasters for us. Even those who cooperated with America obtained nothing, for America abandoned them once their role finished.

Thus, having trust in America is like having trust in shaytan. Dependence on her is reliance upon a malicious enemy that continuously shows hostility to the Islamic ummah, with all of her sections. Even Pakisatn that betrayed Taliban and helped America to enter Afghanistan and destroy Taliban, did not also benefit any thing from America as price for its horrible treachery. America joined with India, the arch enemy for Pakistan, and compelled Prevez Musharraf to concede Kashmir and suppressed the mujahidoon.

The second lesson is not to have trust in the agents of America. The ruling power in Pakisatn was behind the creation of Taleban; but when the interest of America required something different, they abandoned Taliban and tightened the grip around their throat.

The third lesson is the political awareness. The believer must be intelligent and bright and not be taken unaware. Taliban used to associate itself with the ruler of Pakistan at a time when he was completely in her grip. Taliban thought at that time she did well by such action.

As for the last lesson, it is the fact that Islam does not admit compromise. Taliban assumed the power in Afghanistan, so it should have declared it Khilafah, and dissociated itself from the agents of America in Pakistan. At the same time it should have sought help and assistance from the influential people for implementing the rules of shar' properly and seek proper knowledge in it. Instead, they declared it as an

Imarah, which is from one side, linked to Islam; but from the other side it was linked to Pakistan, which is operated by America that strongly opposes the system of Khilafah.

However, the solution is not beyond our reach; it is rather so close. It only requires Pakistan breaks out from the influence of America, and establishes a sincere authority, rather a true Islamic system in it, which is *Khilafah rashidah*. Then it implements the shar' of Allah, makes *jihad fee sabeelillah* and turns together with the mujahidon in Afghanistan and outside Afghanistan to uproot the American influence from Afghanistan and annex it to the Khilafah. This will raise high the banner of Islam (*la ilaha illa Allah, Muhammadun Rasulullah*). Though this matter might look difficult at the first glance, but it is easy for those to whom Allah made it easy.

"زيعب طلا ىلع كلذ امو".

"Indeed this is not hard for Allah". [TMQ:]

(5)

CYPRUS

Cyprus is one of the most important and beautiful Islamic countries. It holds an

important strategic location, and considered the corner stone in the east of Mediterranean Sea. Therefore, the super powers struggled continuously to control it.

It was conquered and opened for Islam at the time of the guided Khaleefah Othman (r.a). He had asked Mu'awiyah, the governor of ash-Sham at the time, to open Cyprus, which took place in 649 BC. Muslims continued to control Cyprus till the end of 19th century. During the last times, it became sometimes target for attacks from Byzantines and Crusaders, but Muslims used to drive them away and extend on it again the authority of Islam.

Therefore, Cyprus is an Islamic land, and an Islamic island. The Greek unbelievers who remained in it are considered people of *Zimmah*, who are not allowed to have control over it, the same as their likes in other Muslim countries.

The power of Russia, in the 19th century, enhanced and it posed threat to the Ottoman state and Britain, which was the leading state, at the time. Britain became concerned about its vital road that passes through Gibraltar to India across Suez Canal. It realized access of Russia to Cyprus that stands at the eastern waist of the Mediterranean Sea, would place Suez Canal under the Russian threat. This came at the time when Britain came out of seven years of war with France (1756-1763) over India, where the influence of France was completely eliminated from India that became entirely in Britain's hands. Maintaining the security of the sea road between the British islands and India across Gibraltar and Suez Canal was vital for Britain. Therefore, Britain used its political shrewdness with the Ottoman state, which had control over the island of Cyprus, in order to reach the island. From another side, the Ottoman state at that time realized the growing power of Russia and feared its access to Cyprus. Britain thought, by way of power, to have a foothold in Cyprus. While the Ottoman state thought, by way of weakness, to maintain its authority over Cyprus. Britain managed to convince, or rather deceive the Khaleefah Abdul Hameed to conclude an agreement, which apparently looked as protection of Cyprus against its occupation by Russia through temporary English presence in it, who will later on leave. This is the way the Kahaleefah looked at that agreement. According to the designs of Britain, the agreement was an introduction to permanent British occupation of the island. Based on this understanding, an agreement was concluded between the Ottoman state and Britain in 1876, which stipulates the following:

- 1) Maintaining the military and political authority to the Ottoman Khilafah.
- 2) The English pay annual royalty of 92 thousands golden coin.
- 3) The English remain under the Ottoman military leaders during their presence in the island.
- 4) The English depart after the cessation of the Russian danger, which England claimed it had reliable information that Russia, was going to attack the Dardanelle and pass through to the Mediterranean Sea and then to Cyprus.

Sultan Abdul Hameed, who is known of his political shrewdness, wanted to tackle the weakness of the sate before the Russians by dragging England to conflict with the Russians. This would halt the Russians danger against Cyprus, protect the island and the English would leave. He did not take account of the cunning and deception of the

English, though he (may Allah have mercy on his soul) looked in his memoirs aware of the malice and deception of the English. However, it appears he knew the English persisted to have a foothold in Cyprus, with or without an agreement. So, he preferred the agreement with strict conditions, betting on the change of international situation and finally removing the English out. However, things did not go the way Sultan Abdul Hameed desired, for the enemies of Allah and His Messenger conspired against him and deposed him of power in 1908. The Union and Progress society assumed the power after him; so they did not attach great importance for the state, and were incapable of fulfilling the plans of Khaleefah Abdul Hameed (may Allah have mercy on his soul). Then, World War I broke out in 1914; and Britain cancelled the treaty and annexed Cyprus to it under the pretext of alliance between the Ottoman State and Germany against Britain in that war. It was annexed officially in 5/11/1914.

After the rebellion of Mustafa Kamal against the Khaleefah by support from the English, formation an authority in Ankara in parallel with the authority of the Khaleefah and sending delegates for negotiating with the English over the peace conditions. Mustafa Kamal ordered his delegate led by Ismat Inonu, who was an English agent like his master, to sign in July 1923, a treaty with the English, in which the government in Ankara recognized the ultimate English authority over Cyprus and annexing it to Britain, thus considering it English territories. It is known, this is one of the services criminal Mustafa Kamal delivered to the English. The abolition of the Khilafah comes at the top of these services, to indicate his loyalty to the English and his treason to Allah, His Messenger and the believers.

It was mentioned in the treaty of Mustafa Kamal that Cypriot Muslims have to accept either the Turkish or English nationality. However those who prefer the Turkish nationality have to leave the island. Article 21 in that treaty had stipulated the following: “Cypriot Turks have the right to hold British nationality; but they have to concede their Turkish nationality within two years after signing this treaty. Whoever wanted to obtain a Turkish nationality must leave the island within 12 months after choosing this right”.

In March 1925, an English governor was appointed over Cyprus; and it was declared as a crown colony. Cyprus continued to officially follow the British crown till 1959, where it was officially declared (an independent republic).

However, the situation in Cyprus became unstable to the English after World War II. This is because Britain emerged from the war weak internally due to the destruction resulting from the war. Then it became less significant internationally, because America emerged as a leading state on the international arena. Thus, America started to look for controlling the colonies of the western states, particularly Britain and France, and Cyprus was not far from her ambitions. As a result, the actual situation in Cyprus started to shake. America has noticed the great political importance of Cyprus in relation to Asia, Europe and Middle East. So it determined to eliminate the English influence in it under the title of ‘abolition of colonies’, which is an American trademark., so as to inherit the western states in their colonies, particularly Britain and France. Thus, she took her first step in that direction, where the church, with

American support, revealed the result of a referendum made to the Cypriot people, which shows they want to get out of the colonization of Britain and join Greece. The result of that referendum carried out on 15/1/1950 was 96%. Since that time the claim of Greece to Cyprus started.

The matter that pushed this claim forward is that Italy handed back 12 islands in the Aegean Sea after it came out defeated in World War II. It had occupied between 1911-1912, and handed them over to Greece after signing the peace treaty in Paris. This pushed Greece to look towards Cyprus with support from America. By encouragement from America, it submitted between 1952-1954 an official application to the UN asking the withdrawal of England from Cyprus. Then it submitted in 16 August, 1954, a complaint against England in the UN, where it demanded right of self-determination to the Cypriot people. However, Britain that was still influential at the international arena foiled these efforts. It used to incite Turkey that was ally to it to oppose the Greek demands and to mobilize the Turkish public opinion against annexing of Cyprus to Greece, a matter, which the Turkish people reject.

However, America continued to coerce Greece for harassing England. As a result America started in 1955 to incite the Roman Orthodox (Cyprus inhabitants of Christians) who were antagonist to the English. The Romans had originally the idea of (Anosys), which means union of Cyprus with Greece or its total annexation to it, but the English continued to oppose this idea. America exploited this situation, and tried to expel the English by stirring disturbances through her agents in the island. She rather encouraged these unrests to become operations with bombs, as it happened in the beginning of 1955, where hundreds of the English were killed.

As a result, England held a conference in London in 29 August 1955 to study the situation in Cyprus. It managed to include Turkey along side Greece for discussing the Cyprus issue. It realized this would lead to the failure of the conference because of the different views the two states carry regarding Cyprus. Thus, the conference did not produce any results. However, the historical significance of London conference is that Turkey has been officially accepted for the first time as a party in the issue, from political aspect.

The disturbances continued in Cyprus, stirred by America and Greece and their followers in the island so as to expel the English influence from it, and inserting the American influence, whether directly or indirectly, by annexing it to Greece that was ally to America. The struggle was fierce because Britain had built two military bases inside the island over an area of about 256 square kilometres. These two bases enjoy complete British sovereignty.

America was interested in removing these two bases and the entire English influence. This is because she delivered Europe in World War II, so she finds herself entitled to inherit its colonies. Therefore, struggle between America and Britain broke out as we mentioned above. This struggle intensified in 1958, where America kindled a revolution in Cyprus against the English by inciting the Greek and pushing them to

demand annexing of Cyprus to Greece. So, they fought against the English to expel them from the island. However, Britain used to have strong control over the island; so it pushed its loyal agent, archbishop Makaryus to lead the revolution against the British occupation, demanding dependence rather than annexation to Greece. Then the British exiled Makaryus to the island of Sechele in the Indian Ocean. This was to increase his popularity, return as leader of Cyprus, and foil the idea of annexing the island to Greece, and instead demand independence. On the other side, Britain pushed the Turks to oppose the annexation of the island to Greece. Thus, Britain managed to frustrate the American plan and maintain its presence in Cyprus. It completed its game by giving Cyprus its independence, where it changed to a republic as a result of the talks in Zurich that continued from 5-11 November 1959. These talks were concluded by signing the document of independence (Zurich Document), which is formed of 27 articles. It gives both of the Turks and Greek in Cyprus the right of Veto concerning matters related to the independence of the island.

In 20 January 1960, Britain enhanced its authority by making Cyprus member in the Commonwealth.

However, America tried to hinder the government process in the island by using the article of the constitution that grants the right of Veto for both sides regarding the future of the island. America endeavoured to incite the Turks by spreading amongst them that Greece wants to annex Cyprus. She used two factors to achieve that. The first is that the public opinion in Turkey stands at the side of the Turks in Cyprus and strongly rejects the control of Greece over Cyprus. The second is that the rulers of Turkey who assumed power through the coup of 1960 were incapable to firmly face America, because some of them got their role in the coup by the help of America, though the leader of the coup, Esmat Inono is of the old friends of England. These two factors helped America to stir the Turkish masses, so as they use the constitutional article of Veto to protest against the conduct of Makarius concerning the island except with the approval of the Turks in Cyprus. This annoyed Britain, so it answered back by suggesting to its agent, the president Makarius to abolish the constitution and refer to the majority rule. This resulted in the movement of the Turks against Makarius. America used this disorder and carried the case to the UN. She aimed at removing the British bases from the island. However, Britain pressured the UN member states and limited the international forces dispatched to the island to forces friend to Britain only, beside its own forces and Canadian forces ally with it. Thus it frustrated the new American plan of using the UN for removing the British military bases from the island; and the island remained effectively in the hand of Britain by the name of the Security Council for the first time.

Struggle continued over the island between America and Britain, where the first tries to remove the British influence and the British military bases, and the second tries to maintain its influence and bases.

Then America tried another approach; so it used her direct influence with Turkey and Greece. She contacted both of them directly, used all possible pressure and proposed three solutions to the island, which all of them focus on eliminating the British

military presence in the island. These are the three solutions:

- 1) The island is annexed to Greece under the pretext the Greek are the majority. Greece compensates Turkey by giving it a Greek island in the Mediterranean Sea instead of Cyprus.
- 2) Cyprus state is eliminated, while the island is effectively divided between Turkey and Greece.
- 3) Two states are formed in the island, but united in a federal state.

It is noticed the three solutions guarantee the removal of the British bases from the island.

However, due to the strong influence Britain used to have in Turkey and Greece at that time, which was equal to that of America, it foiled the three solutions. But America did not halt and proposed a new solution, which requires the guarantee of the independence of Cyprus by the super powers Russia, America, Britain and France. This solution means that Russia particularly would not accept to secure the independence of the island as long as the British bases remained in the island, which requires their removal.

This solution had also failed due to the increasing efforts Britain spent with Turkey and Greece, so they rejected the idea of the super powers security.

Frictions and tensions between the Turks and Greeks of Cyprus continued during the authority of Makarius. Britain used these tensions to strengthen its military presence benefiting from the insecurity there. This is the approach Britain uses when it has influence and power, where it would form a committee or hold a conference, regardless whether it succeeded or not. However, it would keep the island busy with discussions and negotiations, which Britain used as a respite so as to reconsider its position. It did that when it called for London conference in 1955, and the conference it called for in London in 15/1/1964. Both did not produce any result, while the tensions continued in the island.

At that period some events took place that influenced the course of events in Cyprus. Parliamentary elections took place in Turkey in 1973. A coalition was formed between the Republican People party led by the loyal agent of the English, Bulent Ajawid and the National Salvation party led by Najmuddin Arbekan, which is extension to the National Order party, and agent to the English policy. When Arbekan was in Europe, the English foreign minister declared, in the house of Common, the necessity of creating an Islamic party in Turkey. Arbekan returned back to Turkey in a private English aeroplane. This collation that was formed under the patronage of the English is the one that executed the movement of 1974, which was a turning point in the Cypriot issue. This movement represents birth of Turkey, for it was the first military government in the life of the Republic. It proceeded as follows:

In 1973, Ra'uf Danktash became vice president in the Turkish side. On the other side, Makarius was brought from America and chosen again as president. In January 1974, a coalition formed from the Republican People party and the National Order party

officially assumed power in Turkey.

In that year, 5/7/1974 America succeeds in executing a coup in Cyprus that overthrew Makarios. It aimed at eliminating the tensions and imposing the complete authority of the government over all the territories of the island as an introduction to remove the British bases after restoring stability. Britain responded by Turkish military landing at the island. America could not prevent this landing because the American administration was preoccupied at that time with the Watergate scandal that happened at Nixon time. This Turkish military intervention deprived the coup perpetrators the opportunity of forming a united stable state that can remove the British military bases.

The failure of the coup perpetrators to control the island and impose stability in it helped as well in inciting the global public opinion against the coup that was supported by America. So there was a wide global condemnation to this disgraceful coup. America rushed to oppose the coup and considered it threat to its security. It also condemned the Turkish invasion of the island. This in turn contributed to the inability of the leaders of the coup to impose their authority over the capital, let alone the entire island.

America desired to transform the British military bases in the island to become bases subject to NATO so that she controls them through her control over NATO. However, Britain undertook huge efforts to maintain alone its bases in Cyprus, which are very vital for it.

Thus, the island became an area for violent international conflict between America and Britain, for long time. The issue of British military bases in Cyprus was the subject of struggle. Thus, the issue of Cyprus became an issue of military bases more than being an issue of elimination of colonization, or issue of the Turkish and Greek sects.

After the Turkish military landing in the island, its division between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots was effectively sanctified. The Turks controlled the northern part of the island, and they facilitated the entry of Turkish citizens to the island to increase the number of Turks in the island. This would balance the Greek majority in the island and sanction its permanent division between the two sects. This would undoubtedly increase the instability in the island and contribute to confirming the presence of the British military bases in the island forever.

This situation continued as it is in the north after the Turkish landing without officially declaring a state in the north. Though, it effectively exists till 15/11/1983, because Ra'uf Danktash, the governor of the Turkish section of the island, announced the creation of the state of north Cyprus, with obvious English support through the military government in Turkey. This occurred as follows:

In the Greece elections in October 1981, the American agent Andres Papandreou was selected for government. He immediately, in February 1982 went to Cyprus, where,

in his talk, he discharged the brunt of his anger against England. He explained that Greece would act as a state and start 'a crusade campaign' against Turkey and the Cypriot Turks. He said the issue must be transferred to the UN, because it is an international issue. In other words, he spoke as a voice for the American policy. The UN took after that a resolution that recommends the immediate withdrawal of the Turkish army, which it called the occupier, from Cyprus. Then the council of the federal state of Cyprus (the Greek part) took a decision in 17 June 1982 regarding the right of the Cypriot people to self-determination. The Cypriot Turks answered back by declaring the creation of the Turkish republic of Cyprus in its north in 15 November 1983. Thus, England succeeded in protecting its influence in Cyprus. In 18 November 1983, the Security Council condemned this (Turkish) declaration. In other words, America did not support this declaration; and the Security Council issued resolution number 550, in 13 May 1984, in which it described the declaration of Turkish Cypriot republic in the north fragments the island, and it is not accepted internationally.

Furthermore, the troubles in Turkey were continuous and severe. They continued fluctuating till Uzal; the American agent became a Prime Minister in 1983, then president of the republic in 1984. So the time of Uzal started in Turkey.

After the creation of the Turkish republic in north Cyprus, and the long period of the authority of Uzal, the American agent (1984-1990), international meetings and discussions about Cyprus renewed, though lesser than it was before 1980. The plan regarding Cyprus Treaty prepared by the UN secretary in 17 January 1985 in New York, and in 29 March 1986 did not give fruit.

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the satisfaction of America, she turned her attention to the Islamic countries, so it revived the issue of Cyprus. However, the policy of America towards Cyprus after the cold war had differed to what it was before. The thing that changed was her style and not her policy, because in origin, the policy of America was always to ultimately remove the English from Cyprus.

In 1990, New York summit was held and Security Council adopted resolution number 649, through which the UN directed a call to the two sides in Cyprus to find out an acceptable solution, which carries the concept of two communities and two divisions, and the leaders of the two parties have to sit down face to face. The important point in the resolution is that it depended on the situation present in the sixties, rather than that of 1974.

Torgut Uzal gave attention to the subject and showed in 1991 interest in the concept of a quadrant summit that states the Cypriot issue must be between Turkey, Greece, the Turkish Cypriot republic and the Roman Cypriots. In 28 June 1991, he informed the UN secretary, Perez de Culliar in his report to the Security Council that he accepted the concept of quadrant summit. The intention of the quadrant summit was to exclude England; however could not succeed in that because he either died or was killed after a short while.

In 11 October 1991, the Security Council accepted in the UN resolution number 716 that supports the report prepared by the general secretary Perez De Cuilliar regarding the Cypriot issue. This report that was presented in 28 June to the Security Council contained also the idea of the quadrant summit presented by Uzal. In 1992, the Security Council presented to the parties a set of ideas prepared by the UN, which contain 100 article that contain various solutions to the different aspects. The Turkish side did not accept all the ideas of this set, while the leader of the Roman side, Fasilio; the American agent accepted them all. However, during that period Fasilio was deposed and replaced by the English agent, Claidese, who rejected all the articles.

After that, the EU that was created by signing its political treaty in 7/2/1992 in Holland entered the struggle arena when it agreed to examine the Greek Cyprus for joining the EU as representative of Cyprus. The EU announced the application meets all the required conditions. In the same year, and after the selection of Clairdese as president of the republic, Britain thought of initiating the idea of bilateral treaties between Greece and Cyprus, on the assumption they are two different entities, thus removing the American idea of annexing Cyprus to Greece. Therefore, the idea of common defence between Greece and the Roman part of Cyprus was approved, on condition of rejecting the UN set of ideas, speeding the membership of EU and increasing the armament activity. All of these steps have been taken to maintain the current situation in Cyprus and to frustrate the American plans, because the UN set of ideas is an American proposal. England urged on the membership of the EU because if Cyprus became a member in the EU then its issue would not become an international one, rather related to the EU, where it becomes difficult for America to interfere in it.

As regarding the armament, the crisis of S-300 missiles was an important event in 1997. England installed Russian-made S-300 missiles in the Greek island of Crete, which is close to Cyprus, by the Greek army, as part of the common defence between Greece and the Greek part of Cyprus. The purpose of that was to warm up the atmosphere in the island between the Cypriot Turks and Greek, for these missiles strengthen the Greek Cypriots. Accordingly, the demonstrations and disputes in Cyprus at the separation lines reigned over the situation. Therefore, supplying the S-300 missiles aimed at frustrating the peace solutions proposed by America through the UN, by escalating the situation between the two sides and preventing them from setting together for any talks. America took interest in the subject and considered it dangerous. So, it undertook serious attempts with Russia, the source of the missiles, and strong pressure on Greece for withdrawing the missiles. She succeeded in that, and the missiles crisis came to an end.

At the same time, a proportional change took place in the policy of the EU. In January 1997, the EU declared the full membership of Cyprus is linked to the political solution, and the Turkish side must also take part in the EU recommendations. This meant rejecting to examine the application of the Greek Cypriot side alone, as representative of the island, as it was promised before. Greek

reacted against this declaration and informed the EU of its intention in using the right of Veto for it is a founder member in the EU. The change in the policy of the EU was due to American pressure, because she considered the membership of the Greek Cyprus in the EU not enough to expel the English from it. America was at that time interested with expelling the English from Cyprus and removing its bases from it. She has also noticed England play a double game, and there must be solution from the UN that agrees with her demands. In December 1999, in Helsinki, Turkey was accepted within the list of the states recommended for the EU membership. Neither America or Britain opposed to that; they rather both accepted and supported it when it was proposed, but each of them from its own angle. Therefore, after Turkey was accepted in the recommended list of membership, Clinton sent to Turkey a congratulation message, where he said in it: "Your leadership had an obvious role in helping the initiation of discussions regarding Cyprus". In the summit of Helsinki, the EU manifested the necessity of finding a political solution for Cyprus. In other words, the EU did not want to join Cyprus to the union while it faces division and problems, for this creates troubles for it. Therefore, the continuous English-American struggle over Cyprus would bring troubles and problems rather than benefits to the EU. The summit of Helsinki was the fruit of a balanced policy, which says to Turkey (solve the problem of Cyprus and join the EU), and says as well (if it is necessary, Cyprus can join as it is). Since Cyprus is an important strategic location, and because the EU suffered at that time of the international pressure, Cyprus was unlikely to be dispensable.

In November 2000, the EU declared the document of partnership related to the membership of Turkey in the EU. The issue of Cyprus was mentioned in this document, in the section of (short term objectives). This indicated the membership of Turkey in the EU is directly linked with the issue of Cyprus. After that, Danktash withdrew from the indirect talks conducted through the UN general secretary. Then the chairman of the EU council, Romani Brudi announced in 2001 that Cyprus could join the EU with its current situation, and without solving the problem. As a result Turkey replied it is ready to pay any price or alternative for the sake of Cyprus. Thus, talks resumed in January 2001 between Danktash and Clairids. The UN general secretary, Koufi Annan and the special envoy of Cyprus, Alfaro De Suto joined the talks. In 2001, UN general secretary went by himself to Cyprus and joined the talks. In the autumn of 2002, the EU invited Danktash to understand his formal views. During that the UN general secretary invited Danktash and Clairids to New York. America knew that the continuous problems created by Danktash would make him an obstacle in their way, therefore she claimed he was sick and thus kept him in New York for some time after his arrival there. During that time, the general secretary, Koufi Annan prepared the plan that carries his name.

As regarding Turkey, there was a coalition of three parties that governs Turkey. The major influence in it was for the English, while America has some in it. This was during this period of Cypriot talks, and the problems created by Danktash to distance any solution proposed by America through the UN. The members of this Turkish coalition were the English agent, Bulent Ajawid, the chairman of the Democratic People party, the American agent Dawlat Bhishli, the chairman of the National

Movement party, and the English agent, Mas'ud Yelmaz, the chairman of the Mother Homeland party. America faced difficulty in presenting a solution to Cyprus due to the great English presence in the Turkish government. Therefore, America paved the way for toppling the ruling coalition and pushing the group (of old Islamite) who had allied with them under the leadership of Abdullah Ghul and Rajab Tayyeb Ardoghan. In other words they pushed their ally, the Justice and Development party to take the power in Turkey. America undertook many measures to achieve that goal. The most significant and noticeable one was her withdrawal of 5 billion dollars from the Central bank, which led to economic crisis. This economic crisis caused the decline of the popularity of the government to the ground. After that came the statement given by Dawlat Bhishley, the American ally, which is: "Either the elections are held on 3 November or we would withdraw from the coalition". Thus, the government was forced to take the decision of early elections; which were conducted on 3 November 2002. The Justice and Development party led by Rajab Ardoghan won an overwhelming majority in the elections.

Since that moment a government completely loyal to America was formed in Turkey. At that time, the UN general secretary presented his plan (Annan plan) to the parties in Cyprus, benefiting from the accession of America's allies to authority in Turkey. The plan was submitted to Danktash and Clairidis in 11 November 2002, ie one week after the victory of Ardoghan.

Under the shadow of the issue of Cyprus, membership of the EU and the American war against Iraq, the government of Ardoghan undertook a standard number of visits and reception of foreign delegates. It also declared it will solve the problem of Cyprus, the membership of EU and AGSP at the same time. It increased its pressure on Danktash, but with passing by him, because he had deep roots in the issue of Cyprus and support in the Turkish army. Danktash understood the radical change in the Turkish foreign policy, and its endeavour to solve the Cyprus issue according to "Annan paln". Therefore, Danktash spoke harshly in January 2003, saying: "If Turkey is going to abandon its national principles, and it is ready to accept Annan plan as it is, then let it declare that openly. In that case, they can find a person other than me that accepts this plan as it is, put his signature, and thus the problem would be solved".

Annan plan contained a fundamental document, attaché with other five documents. These documents had many other documents linked to them. These documents include: a foundation treaty, arrangements linked to the stage the settlement of Cyprus issue, treaties concluded between the concerned states (Cyprus, Turkey, Greece and England), the matters left to the decision of SC and UN, the matters connected to the conditions required by EU for Cyprus membership in it, the constitution of 1960 and matters related to the land, nationality/citizenship, and ownership, internal security services. Simply, these documents contained every thing related to the arrangement/organisation of the foreign and internal relations of Cyprus. There was no any mention at all of the two English military bases in Dikilia and Acrotiri. This means America and England had both agreed not to touch the two bases. Thus, it can be stated the legal situation of these bases has been sanctioned and

confirmed as it came in the independence treaty, which means they represent a third entity alongside the other two entities of the Turks and Greeks. Beside, England continued through its agent, Danktash, to create obstacles, which led to make some changes in Annan plan, many times. Accordingly, the implementation time of the plan was postponed many times. The different sides were supposed to complete their meetings by 28 February 2003; however the plan was postponed till March 2004.

Danktash encountered a reprehensible defeat in the election undertaken in Cyprus in 14 December 2003. His votes' percent had decreased so much compared to the high number of votes he had obtained before. So, as a president of the republic, he was obliged to confer upon Mohammad Ali Tal'at, America's loyal man, the chairman of the Republic Party, the task of forming the government. As a result, Tal'at formed a coalition with Sirdar Danktash, son of Danktsh, and the chairman of the Democratic Party.

As a result of the pressure by the government of Ardoghan and paving the way in Cyprus for the advantage of America, there was tendency to accept Annan plan. America aims in this plan to form a united Cyprus, which will join EU as a union, and finally remove Cyprus from the grip of England, except its military bases. England, on the other side thought of keeping the current situation, as it is, ie two independent states. Therefore, it endeavoured to frustrate and reject Annan plan, through spreading clandestine propaganda against it. It viewed America would have control over the Cypriot Union once Annan plan was implemented.

Finally, Annan plan was presented to the Cypriot people in 24 April 2004 for voting. However, the result was unexpected, for it was rejected in the south, though it was accepted in the north. This meant the end of Annan plan, though the result was satisfactory and balanced for America, EU and England. Despite America could not achieve success to the plan in the two sides, she however obtained an important advantage in the north. Thus, the influence of England declined; and America would be able to open the issue of Cyprus in future again if necessary. She is now removing the siege imposed against the north (there are voices that demand of that). She will secure to it economic progress, make of it an important business and tourist centre and safeguard wide fame for it. She might also establish a military centre in the area of Ad-Deeb Kirbaz (the tail of the island) so that it becomes a gun aperture directed towards Asia. Thus, she would have controlled the strategic tail (of the island) overlooking Asia and Middle East. Hence, America would have achieved success, though it was not complete.

England had also achieved some share of success, because it did not allow any harm to its influence in Cyprus, or encroachment to its military centres there. However, we cannot say it feels comfortable, because it understands the prime aim of America is to expel it from Cyprus, and she will not abandon that aim easily.

The EU wished that Cyprus became united and joined it as a union, but this did not happen. Therefore, this is considered loss to the EU from this angle. However, the EU obtained an important foothold through considering the application of South

Cyprus alone to it. As regards Cyprus, it is difficult for it to obtain a benefit as long as super powers like England and America struggle over it locally and internationally. However, it might be said it obtained a partial benefit through using its strategic and political position.

Therefore, these countries that struggle over Cyprus, namely America, Britain and EU, will use the results of the elections as a starter to increase their relative success so that it becomes a complete success that achieves their objectives.

Thus, Cyprus will remain a suspended and delicate issue that did not get the right solution. The only solution is to return all of it back to its original body, which is the Ottoman state, or Turkey currently. The sectarian solutions that serve the super powers are undoubtedly colonialist solutions. The true solution is to return the island back to its Islamic origin; and there is no any other solution.

This solution requires from the Muslims to support their brothers in the island and Turkey, rather than turn to them their back. It is strange the agent states present in the Islamic world were always preferably disposed to the Greek side against the Turk side. When the Turks created a republic in north Cyprus, there was no any state of those present in Muslim lands that stood on the side of Muslims authority in the island; they rather recognised the Greek authority over the entire island.

This disgraceful stance of the Muslim rulers towards the important Muslim issues indicates these rulers do not act in compliance with Islam, which they put alongside their names in their identity cards, and nor in observance of the interests of their people. They rather act in compliance with the interests of their masters of the colonialist disbelieving states.

We are aware the puppet rulers in Muslim lands do not dare to adopt any one of Muslims issues. Their situation is well known regarding all the issues of the ummah, and not that of Cyprus only. Their main concern is only to please their masters, whether Muslim lands were preserved or lost.

We, however, realize the ummah is in wait of great good, by the Allah's leave; these rulers will vanish; and the *Khilafah rashidah* is on its way back, by Allah's leave. Then this *Khilafah rashidah* will annex the island (of Cyprus) to the land of Islam, and make of it again a lighthouse that shines in the east of the Mediterranean Sea, so that it restores its old position as a departure point for the conquerors.

"وما ذلك على الله بعزيز "

"Indeed this is not difficult for Allah".

(6)

SUDAN
(The South)

Sudan enjoys an important strategic location in Africa. It also represents the natural depth to Egypt, which is the most important state in the east. Besides, it penetrates through the depths of Africa, coming in contact with Congo, Uganda, Kenya and Central Africa. It overlooks the Red Sea, thus facing Tohama and Hijaz in the Arab Peninsular. Its eastern neighbours are Abyssinia and Eritrea, while Chad and Libya

come in the west. This wide expansion of Sudan is paralleled by wide and huge riches, weather and resources, which made of it the greatest agricultural and animal producer. Nile, with its many tributaries, contributed to the outstanding fertility of its soil, which is capable of providing the main food basket for all the Muslim countries. This makes Muslims enjoy their necessary food security, which is not less important than their military or political security.

Sudan riches are not confined to the agricultural field; rather its underground is full with the precious metals necessary for industry, such as gold, chrome and mica, besides the oil wells in its centre, which flow abundantly. It effectively has the necessary elements required for a super power. This explains the struggle of the super powers, in the past and currently, over dominating its fantastic and incessant riches.

Sudan is an old Islamic country, where Islam entered it in early times, in 31 AH, at the hand of Abdullah b. As-Sarh, the governor of Uthman (ra) in Egypt.

When Sudan was under the British colonial authority, the British administration issued a law in 1922 that made the South Sudan a closed and isolated area. This aimed at preventing the infiltration of the people of the South to the North, and preventing the people in the North from mixing with the South. It formed a local army from the people of the South, under the leadership of English officers, so as to create separation between the North and South, early in time.

This closure of the South encouraged the missionaries to freely carry out extensive christianisation activities for its people. On the other side, colonial authorities prevented the Muslims of the North to sending Islamic missions to the South. This happened when the mission of the Graduates Conference tried in 1938 to send an Islamic mission from Khartoum to the South for propagating Islam.

The British government called in 1947 some people from the North and others from the South, for Juba conference. This conference was the first official trap Britain designed for Sudan, so that the Sudanese people recognise the existence of two entities in Sudan.

The view of Britain towards Sudan was basically built on the existence of two entities in it: one of them is an Arab and Muslim, in the North, while the other was Christian-pagan in the South. This is the same basis that America adopted later on.

Before the British colonial power left Sudan in 1956, Britain prompted a revolt in the South of Sudan in 1955. This was the revolt that preoccupied all the Sudanese governments that assumed the power, since that date till today.

After the independence, Britain appointed puppet rulers who accepted the South as an inherited problem that needs special solution. In the round table conference held in 1965, the parties of the North and the South met and discussed the solution, on the same basis laid down by Britain. However, they did not reach an agreement, and thus the problem was more aggravated.

Sadiq Al-Mahdi, one of the most prominent politicians in Sudan, recognised this problem, since early time, before the constituent assembly. He demanded transforming Sudan from a united republic to federal republic, and giving autonomy to South Sudan under the pretext of having a special situation. He said in 1965: “The political parties in the North and South have reached now an agreement draft that gives the South a local status, which accommodates its special situation, and gives it as well a decentralized authority”.

The politicians in Sudan differed regarding the nature of the special status of Sudan. In 1967, the Prime Minister, Ismail Al-Azhari, launched an attack against the local authority, which Al-Mahdi called for. He instead called for giving the South autonomy only. Uganda was entrusted since that time of giving sanctuary to an exiled government so as to become a concentration point for invading the South.

Britain left the problem of the South as a wedge, by which it kept Sudan busy through the decades that followed the independence. It also placed the seed of the separation of the South from the North, before it left Sudan. Later on, the western countries looked after that seed and watered it to the point that the British agent rulers and the American agent rulers who governed Sudan did not differ over it. They did not differ over the view that the South had a special status. This was the view of most of the parties, whether they were loyal to America, like the Khatmiyya sect, represented by the Sudanese National Unity party, led by Al-Mirghani, or loyal to Britain like the Mahdiyya – Ansar sect, represented by the Ummah party, led by Al-Mahdi. All of them approved the secession, in a form or another; the difference was only over the styles.

The Mahdi government made dialogue on the basis of autonomy or local authority. Numeiri government implemented the local authority and appointed an upper council for assuming the authority in the South. The Salvation government, led by Omer Hasan Al-Bashir, executed the federal authority and presented the idea of right to self-determination to the Southerners. The opposition parties did not differ with Al-Bashir over this idea. The evidence to this is that the National Democratic Gathering, which gathers the parties opposing the Salvation government led by Al-Bashir, had offered right to self-determination to the Southerners and Juba Mountains in the conference of vital issues that was held in Asmara, the capital of Eritrea in 1995.

The treacherous ideas, such as federalism and right to self-determination to the people of the South became political demands and legitimate political realities. Thus, the sons of the Islamic Mahdi revolt that broke out in 1881 against the English occupation in defence of Sudan and its Islam, these sons changed to become agents for implementing the English project. That great revolt had levelled many reprehensible defeats against the English army at that time, and reclaimed capital, Khartoum from their hands and killed the British commissioner in it, in 1885.

Sudan, like other colonies, had been a field for strong international struggle between the old colonialist, Britain and the new colonialist, America, over its domination.

When it was given independence in 1956, it was with Britain. It remained so with the efficient leadership of Mahdi party and other politicians loyal to Britain. It continued to fluctuate between Britain and America since then till 1969, where Ja'far Numeiri, with support from Nasser, the main America agent in the region at that time, led a successive military coup against the parties and politicians loyal to England. Numeiri held authority with military grip; and America successively managed to concentrate its influence within the army during his relatively long term of government.

Under the rule of Numeiri, the problem of the South developed worse and became more complicated. There were some factors that contributed to the complication of the problem. One of which was the neglect of the South and absence of development in it, by all the rulers that assumed the power. Another factor was their approval to give the South a special status that would lead to its separation. John Garang became prominent in the South at the end of Numeiri rule. He was an officer in the Sudanese army, who was sent to the South to maintain security. He however seceded from the government and formed a special militia loyal to him by the help of Uganda and coordination with America. This aimed at creation of a Christian - pagan force that prevents the spread of Islam in the South. It was also a tool in the hand of America, where it would use it for exercising pressure against the Sudanese government and directing it the way she wants. When the problems accumulated in Sudan, in all of its security, political, economic and social aspects, America found it necessary to get rid of Numeiri. So, Suwar ad-Dahab, one of the generals of the army, made a coup against Numeiri when he was abroad. When Numeiri tried to return back to Sudan and challenge the coup, Husni Mubarak, the Egyptian president, prevented him from doing so in compliance with orders from America, and he forced him to stay in Cairo. Suwar ad-Dahab was already known as one of the military loyal to Numeiri. His coup was evidence that most of the senior officers in the Sudanese army became completely under the American influence.

Suwar ad-Dahab remained only one year in authority, but the real authority was in the hand of the army loyal to America. He handed the authority to the politicians and allowed running elections; so the English agents returned to power. Sadiq Al-Mahdi formed the government in 1985, where Sudan was left to fumble about for three years during his government. In that period, a session was arranged in Washington in February 1987, and a meeting was held in London in September 1987, where they both were related to the South separation plans. Other initiatives were submitted in Africa. All of these initiatives emphasised the formal unity of Sudan, besides the focus on the cultural diversity, the importance of development and division of wealth and authority. The army, at that period watched the situation closely; and when the matters deteriorated to a point the people wished the military back, Omer Hassan Ahmad Al-Bashir made a successful military coup in August 1989. He removed the government of Al-Mahdi, and benefited of the mistakes of the previous military, like Numeiri. So, he engrafted his military government by Islamic shade. He brought Hasan Turabi, the chairman of the People Congress and the leader of the main Islamic movement in Sudan, closer to government, so as to give his military authority legal shade and popularity, which Numeiri lacked in the past.

Thus, the military loyal to America got their strong hold over Sudan, and accordingly America strengthened its grip over Sudan through the army. The military American agents thus could achieve that which the English parties and politicians failed to do by undertaking serious political actions that lead to the confirmed secession of the South from the North.

Since Al-Bashir assumed the authority in Sudan, the mode of negotiations, meetings and initiatives increased, paralleled with escalation in the encounters and battles in the South so as to give these negotiations credibility and justification for achieving vital progress in this delicate and dangerous issue.

There were meetings in Nairobi in 1989 under the auspices of the previous American president, Jimmy Carter. These were introduction to those that followed. There were meetings under the charge of Carter between the Sudanese government delegation led by Mohammad al-Amin Khalifah and the delegation of the revolt movement led by Lam Akol. In 1992, other negotiations were held at the initiative of the previous Nigerian president, Ebrahim Babinjida in Abuja, between the government delegation led by Mohammad Al-Amin and the delegation of the revolt movement led by William Noon representing Garang group, and Lam Kol representing Nasser group. These talks agreed on the necessity of solving the problem by dividing the resources and creating a political institution that works based on racial, linguist and cultural plurality in Sudan. In 1993, negotiations were held in Entebbe in Uganda under the supervision of the Ugandan president, Yuri Musivini, between the government led by Ali Hajj Mohammad, and the delegation of the People's Army (revolt movement) led by Garang. In the same year, and one month after the past talks, a meeting was held in Nairobi between the government delegation led by Ali Uthman Mohammad Taha and the delegation of the revolt movement. Talks continued in Kenya and Nigeria till a meeting was held in Nairobi in 17 March 1994, with initiative from the committee of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), led by the Kenyan president Daniel arap Moi and the membership of the presidents of Uganda, Ethiopia, Eritrea and the presence of Omer Hassan Al-Bashir and the leader of the two factions of revolt movement. The negotiations continued till it faced the disaster of signature on "Joint Communiqué and Machakos Protocol" in 20/7/2003. This was the most dangerous in the process of ceding the South from Sudan. It was a fruit of tireless efforts that lasted for tens of years, and was introduction to the final (peace treaty). The protocol contained texts of delicate wording, considerable danger and includes all the requirements of secession, such as right to self-determination. The texts were worded with great attention so as to achieve the aim with minimum costs. The most dangerous thing in the protocol is to stipulate an international role and a defined mechanism for securing the implementation of the articles of the agreement so as to achieve the secession. Thus, this protocol became a basis for all the forthcoming negotiations. The talks were then resumed under international auspices of America, Britain, Norway, Italy and the states of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD). This was for discussing the details of the questions that were left suspended at that time, such as dividing the wealth and authority and others. It was noticed there was no disagreement in the talks between the international sides, particularly America and Britain.

In 25 September 2003, the security and military agreement between the government and the revolt was signed. It stipulated presence of three armies: the army of the government, the army of the rebels and a joint army from the government and the rebels. Thus, the criminal secessionist revolt factions were preserved as an army parallel to the official army, and legally equal to it. The agreement also stipulated the necessary withdrawal of the government army from the South within a maximum period of two years and a half.

The multitude of the armies in the country, as it came in the agreement, clearly aimed at multiplicity of power centres. This would threaten the security and stability in the country and thus drag it easily into wars, conflicts and fragmentation, particularly when we speak about the rebels' army, which is linked with the disbelieving west in terms of the objective, training and armament. How is it possible for the people of Sudan to feel safe when the rebels' army exists in Khartoum, South of Blue Nile and Nuba mountains, besides it alone controls the entire South of Sudan?

The idea of having two or three armies has been proposed and imposed on the government by America after the negotiations reached a deadlock. The Sudanese newspaper of Akhbar ul Yawm' mentioned that explicitly in 25/9/2003. Thus, America imposed the agreement on the government, and warned it of various types of threats if it rejected the agreement.

In 17/1/2004, the Sudanese government and the rebels' movement signed the agreement of dividing the wealth. Accordingly, the oil and other revenues in South Sudan and the other three disputed areas were divided equally between the government and the rebels. Besides, it was agreed to set up two separate bank systems: one belongs to the government, and the other to the South. This aims at sanctioning secession from economic aspect as it was sanctioned from military aspect.

Negotiations still continued over dividing the authority and the future of the three disputed regions, which are Ebi, South of Blue Nile and Juba Mountains. Al-Bashir government is about to concede Abi to the rebels according to an American paper carried by Reverenced John Danforth, the America envoy of Bush to Sudan. This paper was submitted to the negotiators in Nivasha, and it contained giving the people of Abi the right to self-determination as that given to the people of the South.

It also contained the agreement of security measures stated in paragraph (c) article (4), which stipulates a joint force in (Juba Mountains made of 6 thousands) and in (South of Blue Nile made of 6 thousands). This represents an introduction to creating a special status to the three regions on the same model of South Sudan.

The newspapers published in Khartoum mentioned in 20/3/2004 the details of the American paper that was submitted to the two sides of negotiations in Nivasha (the government and the rebels' movement) for solving the issue of Ibyi. They are almost the same proposals presented by the rebels' movement, which the government rejected. The most dangerous matter that came in this paper is (that the people of Ibyi

make a separate referendum at the same time of the referendum in Sudan, which comes after the transitional period, so as to decide whether they remain with the North or join Bahr el-Ghazal). John Danforth said in a press conference he held in Nivasha, which was published in the Sudanese newspaper of 'Akhbar ul-Yawm', issue number (3378) in 20/3/2004: "President Bush is annoyed, he thinks peace can be achieved before the end of the current month, and the American administration considers the side that obstructs the peace process responsible for the collapse of the negotiations". All of this confirms the impartiality of the American administration and it completely and totally takes the side of the rebels' movement. It also shows the explicit threat of the administration to the government if it did not approve the paper (as it came in the press conference made by the special American envoy for peace in Sudan, John Danforth). This confirms the American paper is the final stance of the American government regarding the issue of Ibyi.

The rebels' movement rushed to accept the paper, which is natural to do for, in origin, it is its proposals.

The Sudanese government accepted the paper as a basis for negotiation, according to the Sudanese newspaper 'As-Sahafah', issue (2882) in Sunday 21/3/2004. This came in a broad meeting attended by president Al-Bashir, the leaders of the ruling party, and some of the army generals, besides three people of the negotiating team who returned back from Nivasha. They extensively discussed the American proposal and considered it suitable as a basis for negotiation. This indicates the impotence of the government and its emaciated stance.

The position of those who described the American proposal to be reconciliatory confirms their submission to the American pressures and their endeavour to please her. While Allah (swt) says:

"والله ورسوله أحقُّ أن يُرضوه".

"Indeed Allah and His Messenger are more worthy to be pleased". [9: 62]

The American embassy in Khartoum announced on Thursday, 13/5/2004 that the next week will witness the signature of the agreement between the Sudanese government and the 'Sudanese People's Liberation Movement' (SPLM), led by Doctor George Garang, over the three regions and the division of the authority. Besides the final agreement would be signed in the middle of next month. One of Garang Movement officials confirmed the main points of the Peace Agreement are ready.

The Charge de Affaires of the American embassy in Khartoum, Jerard Kaloshi said also in the same date that the mid of next month, June will witness the signature of a comprehensive Peace Agreement in Nairobi between the Sudanese government and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement' (SPLM). He added before a limited number of journalists on Wednesday – Thursday night that his country started, since some time, constructive discussions with the Sudanese government. He said the American administration would start complete normalization of her relations with

Khartoum once peace agreement was concluded and the phase of complete and final cease-fire arrangements was reached.

Kaloshi said lifting the American sanctions from the Sudanese government depends on three issues, which are cooperation in the dossier of fight against international terrorism, conclusion of peace agreement through the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), and production of comprehensive progress in the dossier of human rights. He said Washington expects lifting the state of emergency after signing the peace agreement. The Sudanese People's Liberation Movement' (SPLM), led by John Garang confirmed that "the main points of the Peace Agreement are ready", but it recommended "seeking the help of a third party as an arbitrator regarding the remaining details in case the first deputy of the president of Sudan, Ali Uthman Mohammad Taha and Garang failed to solve them".

UN sources indicated, "There are some difficulties that face the Sudanese negotiators". However the official spokesman of (SPLM), Yasser Irman said, "the main issues have been solved. The remaining details should have not taken all the time they too; they need decisions from both sides for solving them, and the movement considers this viable". He confirmed, "the main points in the agreement are ready; and the two sides have to proceed to finalizing and signing the agreement".

He revealed that "the remaining issues are two types: one of them relates to rewording of some paragraphs of the agreement, while the other is objective that relates to the Blue Nile and Juba Mountains, besides the central authority". He went on explaining, "that Khartoum offered the Movement 40% of the authority in Blue Nile and Juba Mountains, and 60% for the government. It also offered the Movement 28% of the central authority while the Movement demands of 38%". As regards the association of other political powers, Erman pointed out "that study of the participation of others has started and still continues between the two sides". As regards the capital, he mentioned, "that the issue of the capital has been settled, and the two sides agreed on the main points".

During these talks and before finalizing the negotiations regarding the secession of the South under the leadership of the rebel John Garang, there was emphasis on the region of (Darfor), west of Sudan. Three factors have created and aggravated this problem:

These are local competition over the land and pastures, foreign intervention and incitement of the problem, and the neglect of the Sudanese government in looking after its citizens as dictated by Islam with fairness and kindness.

As regarding the local competition, Darfor accommodates the African tribes of (For) and other Arab tribes. The struggle started when the natural resources declined at a time the flocks and the planted areas increased. Moreover, the Arab tribes that have camels looked for owning lands for grazing. On the other side the African tribes of (For) refused to share the land and pastures with Arabs, as being their owners through inheritance.

Revolt started dependent on the tribe of (Zaghawa), but these wanted to attract other tribes in the rebel. So they started to scare them by invading them and imposing taxes against them. Thus, the tribes faced two options: either they join the rebel or form militia to protect themselves against the attack. So, these tribes formed militia, which they soon became strong due to the availability of weapons that come from the neighboring countries. This aggravated the situation, which became worse and complicated every day. Thousands of lives were lost, hundreds of villages were burnt and hundreds of thousands of people were driven away from their homes and left without bedding except the sky and the ground. Some of them fled to Chad fearing for their lives.

As regarding the foreign intervention and incitement of the problem, the Europeans, particularly France and Britain, stirred the incidents of Darfor. The evidence on this is that the rebels from the African tribes of For received support from Chad and its rulers loyal to France, in term of supplies, concentration point and seeking refuge. London worked as media center for the leaders of the revolt.

America tried to cover up her agent, Al-Bashir by giving statements only. She did not demand from his government to abstain from suppressing the rebels, though she could do that. However, after the crisis aggravated and developed into human disaster, the human organizations and UN – incited by Europe – exercised pressure on Sudan and demanded it should hold its support to the Arab militia (Janjaweed) that maltreated the African, as it is circulated.

The media focused the light on the incidents of Darfor, in terms of the number of dead that reached thousands, and the misplaced that reached one million. The media described the events in Darfor as the greatest human disaster in this century, and demanded immediate intervention by the international community; otherwise more thousands of African would die monthly. After all that had happened, America found she is obliged to intervene and join and lead the campaign. She ordered the Sudanese government to stop the disaster through some requests: sending 6000 Sudanese police to Darfor for keeping security of the African citizens and dissolving the (Janjaweed) militia.

The Europeans were not satisfied with these America measures. They rather demanded imposing sanctions against Sudan and dispatching foreign forces to Darfor. Europe, particularly France started to raise doubts about the role of America in imposing sanctions against Sudan.

The British stance was strangely hostile against the Sudanese government. Britain worked to embarrass America through agitation, exaggeration and issuing provocative statements against the Sudanese government.

America did not wish to discuss the issue of Darfor except after finishing the issue of the South, signing the agreement between Garang and the Sudanese government and proceeding in the steps of its implementation. After that she would move towards the

issue of Darfor. As for Europe: France and Britain, they wanted to raise the issue and inflame the situation at the same time so as to create troubles to the government of Al-Bashir, which is loyal to America, for overthrowing or penetrating it.

The Charge de Affairs in the American embassy, Jerard Kaloshi declared in the middle of this month, May 2004 that the situations in the province of Dafour, west of the country are considered of vital importance in the dossier of human rights in Sudan. He added he had reservations regarding the link of the peace process in the South with achieving peace in the province of Darfor. This indicates America endeavors to complete the measures for the secession of the South before she moves to focus on the subject of Northern regions.

However, Europe: France and Britain understood this point, so they concentrated on raising the issue of Darfor, militarily, politically and in the media to embarrass America and destabilize the authority of Al-Bashir, loyal to America. This is after America managed to have the effective role in the subject of the South, and marginalized the role of Europe in it. Therefore, Europe: France and Britain, wanted to have effective role in Darfor that compensates their weak role in the South.

In conclusion, America was obliged to take these measures against the Sudanese government after she was embarrassed before the international public opinion because of Darfor problem, which was blown up quickly and suddenly. Had the problem remained internationally within reasonable limits, under control, and not blown up, America would have not intervened. However, France and Britain provoked it.

Therefore, the foreign intervention and provocation had a prime role in the revolt of Darfor.

As regarding the neglect of the Sudanese government in looking after the affairs and its confusion about the matter, this is clear from leaving the problem to grow and exacerbate. This is the case despite that such problems in the tribal areas are normal. Darfor is a Sudanese province, in the west of Sudan, along the borders with Chad. The area of this province is about that of France. It accommodates Arab and African tribes who are all Muslims. The province is called Darfor after the name of the African tribe (For). The Arab tribes joined them and shared with them living, deen and destiny.

The problems that usually occurred between the tribes were simple and related to areas of farming, irrigation, grazing and water collections. The leaders of the tribes used to quickly solve such problems. It is well known that this type of problems is normal in the tribal areas, and it is one of the natural disputes that arise in the mobile tribal communities.

The government did not solve such disputes with wisdom and good caring, by providing pastures to the flocks' owners, and supplying the needs of farming and irrigation to the landlords, who live in the villages. They could have done this by

bringing both sides together and look after them impartially, thus preventing the use of the problem for intervention. The government instead left the matters between the Muslims, Arab and African to exacerbate and complicate. They left the African militia expand with the support of France through Chad. They left Britain give them wide media support, and Garang, the rebel of the South, gave them covert support. The government gave also support to the Arab militia. Thus things turned into utter confusion; the crime spread, the people dispersed, and the state left the militia struggle against each other without intervention from the state so as to stop them and look after the affairs of both sides. Had not America been embarrassed by Europe, and then intervened by ordering Sudanese government to as a state in settling the problem, the militia would have continued struggle in a field independent of the state and its order.

Therefore, instead Al-Bashir government contained this militia and made conciliation between the tribes; it escalated the situation and used its land and air forces to support the Janjaweed, thus kindling the bloody struggle between the Muslims. Then it started to fumble about solving the problem and wait solution from other countries. It even waited from John Garang, the rebel of the South, who separated the South to help. The Sudanese foreign minister declared in 14/5/2004 saying: “You – addressing Garang – have relation with the rebels in Darfor and you must have a positive role in solving the problem”. Before that, the government official in charge of the Sudanese Government committees responsible for implementing the government recommendations in Darfor said: “The final solution of the problem in Darfor must be through John Garang, once the problem of the South was solved and he comes to Khartoum for assuming his post as Vice president. This is because Garang is more capable in solving such disputes due to his long experience in them”.

These are the officials statements though they realize Garang movement encourages revolt in Darfor. In a press conference in 14/5/2004, the Sudanese foreign minister answered, by saying ‘yes’ to a question from a journalist that said: Do you consider Garang movement responsible for the revolt in Darford? Despite this, the Sudanese officials ask Garang to solve their problem. No doubt the solution he seeks for the province of Darfor is its Secession from Sudan like the South.

Thus, the position of the Sudanese government was so disgraceful that it asked the leader of the revolt in the South to solve the problem of the revolt in Darfor.

The Sudanese government still deals with the situation in a way that would definitely lead to the aggravation of the situation in Darfor and other Northern regions. Though it knew the relief organizations supplied the rebels with arms, it approved they resume their activities there. It also approved the presence of African supervision groups that will give the rebels a cover till they unite their forces and prepare for a new revolt. The Sudanese foreign minister was asked in the mentioned press conference: Are you please with the agreement that allows Ugandan forces to enter South Sudan? He answered: Are you pleased with every thing you do? Sometimes you do things just because they are required by necessity. He said this because he is aware of what such forces will do, in terms of encouraging and supporting the revolt.

It is astonishing to know that the Sudanese government disapproved the withdrawal of the UN so-called human organizations from Darfor. It actually requested they remain to look after the affairs of Darfor citizens. This is despite the government knew better than others that these organizations work to sow unrest and smuggle weapons in the relief boxes and make contact with revolt centers, as it happened with the UN plane that was caught while carrying weapons and supplies to the rebels in Darfor. The same happened before, with the Red Cross plane. The state should have looked after the affairs of its citizens with fairness and kindness, instead of disapproving the withdrawal of these organizations.

The government's carelessness, abandonment and submission towards the vital issues is the first and main cause of these calamities. The state should have interfered in Darfor so as to isolate the agents who call for revolt, by explaining the *hukm shar'i* regarding the distribution of the wealth in a region whose population are 100% Muslims. Instead of doing so, it abandons them under pressure of the international organizations, IGAD, the American enemy, and the EU, particularly France, Germany and Britain. So it accepted the presence of foreign forces and diplomatic missions from Europe and UN, besides continuing dialogue with America, the source of evil. Thus, the country became open for international interventions. Furthermore, the government asks for solutions to Darfor from Garang and America that supports him. It might think as long as the Sudanese regime complies with America she would support it and protect it at any cost. This is despite America does not give any account to her agents once their presence conflicted with her interests, or they executed their assigned roles.

Through its repeated concessions in the South in compliance with the orders of the master of the White House, we find it opens the gate before revolts all over Sudan, under many political and economic pretexts. Every body however knows the extent of the devastating economic crisis from which Sudan suffers despite the diversity and richness of its resources. The only cause of all this is the failing policies of the government due to their disagreement with *shar'* of Allah, and because the government does not rule with this *sahr'* and nor looks after the affairs of the citizens with fairness and kindness.

The Sudanese government is steadily moving towards committing treason to Allah, His Messenger and all the believers through its surrender in Nivasha. Once a comprehensive peace agreement was signed in Nairobi in the middle of next June, as the Charge de affairs in the American embassy in Khartoum, Jirard Kaloshi said, the gate will be open for the remaining different regions in Sudan to demand the same results obtained by the South. As a result, Sudan will continue to revolve in a long series of unceasing conflicts.

The Sudanese interior minister, Abdul Rahim Hussein, confirmed this conclusion where he commented on the events of Darfor saying: "It seems the demands of rebels in Darfor are similar to those of the negotiators in the South, such as the right to self-determination and having an independent army". Concession of any foot of Muslim

lands to the authority of any disbelieving enemy is a great crime in the sight of Allah. This would encourage other regions for secession and enable the enemy to demand more concessions, because any concession, even the smallest, would leave the gate wide open for more concessions.

The Arab poet said:

*Whoever feels himself insignificant, humiliation becomes easy for him.
This is like the dead person who does not feel the pain of his wounds.*

The example of concessions in Palestine, Indonesia and that which is going on in Sudan, all of this pronounces this fact.

It is strange as well as painful that the (opposition) parties in Sudan, which oppose the government in almost every thing, they agree with it regarding the crime of conceding the South to the authority of the rebel Garang, based on American planning and arrangement, and the negotiations that take place with the rebels in Darfor, which might lead to its secession as the South. This reveals the bad stance of the parties that call themselves opposition but do not fear Allah regarding the abandonment of the Muslim lands.

The Sudanese government has to choose only one of two options:

First: It persists in the error (*batil*), continues the policy of concessions, depends on America for solving its issues and makes the country a field for struggle between America and Europe.

Second: It returns back to the truth (*haqq*), where returning back to the haqq is virtue; follows the shar' of Allah, thus it cancels its agreement with Garang and stops its talks with the rebels of Darfor, and addresses the issue of the country's unity based on the fact it is a vital issue that must not be tolerated, for it is an issue of life or death.

As regarding the first option it would draw the country into a great disaster: humiliation, weakness, division, fragmentation and destruction, which is treason to Allah, His Messenger and the believers.

As for the second option, it is glory, might, community, unity, prosperity and gaining pleasure of Allah (swt) and His Messenger (saw).

Are the rulers of Sudan going to repent, and thus choose that which pleases Allah and His Messenger, so they make good deeds that benefit them in the dunya and akhira? Thus, a Khilafah is established in Sudan, which unifies Sudan, eliminates the rebels and destroys the American and Western influence in Sudan, both in the North and the South. Then Islam sets off from Sudan strongly to the different parts of Africa, spreading guidance between the people, with da'wa and jihad fee sabeelillah.

"وَلْيَنْصُرَنَّ اللَّهُ مَن يَنْصُرُهُ، إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَقَوِيٌّ عَزِيزٌ".

“Indeed Allah will help those who help Him. Verily Allah is Strong, Almighty”. [22: 40]

(7)

Iraq

Iraq is the cradle and source of old human civilizations, such as Assyria, Babylon, Nineveh (Neenawa), Ore and others. It is one of the most important and deep-rooted parts of the world, where it goes back deep in history.

Muslims conquered Iraq at the time of Omer b. Al-Khattab (ra), in 13-23 AH, 634-644 AC. It became one of the important Muslim lands, where the big Islamic conquests started and set out. Some of the greatest battles of Islam took place on its soil, like Qadisyya and Mada'in. Many great cities were also built in it, like Basra, Kufa, Wasit, Baghdad, Samirra and Mousul.

Iraq is the twin and reserve of Ash-Sham, and it is the extension for Arab Peninsular. The two rivers: Tigris and Euphrates cross its land, thus making of its wide plains the best fertile and productive lands in the world.

Its distinctive geographic location at the head of the Gulf made of it one of the most important roads that connect Europe with the Indian Ocean. In the modern colonial era, Iraq won special importance for Britain, because it was considered a prime trading road to India, which was a jewel in the British crown. Its importance increased after the discovery of oil in it, at the beginning of 20th century.

Iraq remained a part of the Ottoman Khilafah till World War I, where struggle over it between Britain on one side and the Ottoman State and Germany on the other escalated. Britain tried to snatch it from the Ottoman State during the war. So it occupied Al-Basra in the first year of the war, Al-Amara in the second year, but faced great defeat in Al-Kut in the third year. However, in the fourth year, the British managed to occupy Baghdad in 11 March 1917, led by General Mood. They continued their drive to the north, where they occupied Al-Musul in October 8th, 1918. Thus, the entire of Iraq fell in the hands of the English and was placed under British guardianship.

After that Britain appointed its stooge Faisal b. Hussein b. Ali, the governor of Makkah, as a king to Iraq. This was a sort of compensation for his father's loss in Hijaz, which was given to Al-Saud.

Britain retained under the Hashemite royal authority three military bases, which are Ar-Rashid in Baghdad, Al-Habbaniyya, north of Baghdad and Ash-Shi'aiba near al-Basra. The British military, political, economic and cultural advisers were the true rulers of the country. The British ambassador in Baghdad had the final word in governing Iraq throughout the Hashemite rule that continued till 1958. Thus during that period Iraq became a true British oasis.

In World War II, Hitler, the Chancellor of Germany tried to challenge the English in Iraq. So, he made contact with Ghazi, the king of Iraq, who opposed the English. The king responded favourably with him; but Britain used to keep an eye on him. Once it discovered his relationship with the German, it quickly got rid of him by killing him in a car accident. According to the order of succession to throne, his young son, Faisal the second became a king. The British appointed his uncle, Abdul Ilah as a prince regent and crown prince, who remained loyal to the British crown till his death in the coup of 1958.

In 1941, Germany repeated its attempt to take Iraq from the English. So, it supported

Rasheed Aali Al-Kilani who managed to take the authority in March 2nd, 1941, and immediately declared war against Britain, taking side with Germany. However, Hitler could not supply him with land troops for help; he rather sent him some German air squadrons.

Britain was so much frightened of this sudden Iraqi coup, and the danger posed by the access of the Germans to Iraqi oil fields. So it determined to very quickly overthrow it. Its forces advanced quickly to Baghdad and occupied it. Al-Kilani fled the country, four of the officers that participated in the coup were killed, Abdulilah was restored to the throne, and Britain confirmed again its grip over the country.

The Iraqi resistance against the British colonialist did no cease during the entire period of colonialism. There was violent resistance against occupation in 1920, followed by strong resistance from time to time. However, British control over Iraq continued for long time due to the challenge to the resistance undertaken by the stooge government of Abdulilah and Nouri Said, who was the strong and effective ruler in it. This is besides inciting division between the various sects and trends, following the British policy of 'divide and rule'.

America entered as a new player in struggle over Iraq after she abandoned her isolation after World War II. She started competing with Britain over controlling the oil of Iraq. America had, since San Rimo conference in 1920, demanded from Britain her share in the oil of the Gulf. Britain was the leading state at that time, so it unequivocally rejected the American demand. This prompted Wilson, the American president at that time to send a letter to the British government saying: "You want to pursue a kind of colonialism, which became old fashion". Britain continued after World War II to resist the American pressure for obtaining bigger share of the oil of the Gulf. However, it could not ultimately prevent her from getting that. Churchill, the British Prime Minister wrote to Lord Biffer Brook, a member in the British ministry of war, in reply to a memorandum regarding the US demands of oil: "I understand you well; but I am afraid the post war world might collapse if we joined it while fighting America over the oil".

The American president, Roosevelt sent at the end of World War II a presidential committee to the Middle East. It visited Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar. After its return it submitted to president Roosevelt its report that starts with the following phrase: "The oil of the Middle East is the greatest treasure the nature left to the history; and the economic and political influence of this treasure will be very serious". When the secretary of state, James Pearnas asked president Roosevelt: "President! What is the share of the oil of the Middle East that we must control? Roosevelt kept silent for a while and replied saying: Not less than 100%".

Harold X, one of the American delegates abroad wrote to the American president, Roosevelt saying: "Middle East is a huge world galaxy of oil fields that has no parallel in the world. Saudi Arabia is the sun of this galaxy, for it is the biggest oil well in Middle East. Its conditions are suitable, for its king Abdul Aziz Al Saud wants two things: money and protection of the throne. USA must guarantee these two

things”. Thus, the matter was arranged with King Abdul Aziz when president Roosevelt met him on the American warship Queensea in Suez Canal. America won the oil of Saudi Arabia in accordance with a treaty between the king and the company of (ARAMCO). This company consisted at that time of four oil companies, which were New Jersey, Texaco, Sokal and Sokoni Vacuum.

The manager of Sokoni Vacuum stood in 1945 to literally speak: “The management of oil affairs differs from the management of any other commodity. The oil affairs are 90% politics, while only 10% are oil”. Then he added: “If it was inevitable upon America to manage the affairs of oil in the world, then she is obliged to do that all the time, even outside the bounds of its regional policy and outside the bounds of the international law if that was necessary”.

However, Britain that conceded to America the oil of Saudi Arabia and part of the oil in Iran, it did not concede to her the oil of Iraq. It continued to safeguard Iraq as its main basis in the region. So, it annexed Iraq to each of Turkey, Iran and Pakistan to form Baghdad Pact in February 1955, and put all of them under its control.

America endeavoured to infiltrate this British hegemony over Iraq using a military coup that was prepared like that of Nasser’s coup in Egypt against king Farouq. A movement of free (military) officers was organised under the leadership of Abdul Karim Qassim and Abdul Salam Aarif, following the model of the movement of free officers in Egypt. The situation in the region was adequately used, particularly the success of Nasser in his coup against king Farouq, the failure of the trilateral invasion against Egypt and the start of banishment and weakness of Britain in the region. Abdul Karim Qassim and Adul Salam Aarif led a successful coup in 14 July 1958, which overthrew the royal system in Iraq and established the Iraqi republic. Abdul Nasser immediately welcomed the military that led the coup. Britain tried to intervene for stopping the coup, so its forces landed in Jordan, American dispatched her forces to Lebanon, Turkey mobilised its forces to its borders with Iraq, and king Hussein called the states of Baghdad Pact to restore the royal system to Iraq. The situation became tense and the matters complicated. The Soviet president, Khrucheve strongly warned the western countries, particularly Britain and Turkey, of the consequence of intervention in Iraq. The Soviet army mobilised it forces along its borders with Turkey, and America connived with them. Thus, Britain feared after this escalation, retreated and things calmed down. The new republic system in Iraq thus stabilized and Iraq got out of the military and political English grip after Iraq withdrew from Baghdad pact. Iraq also withdrew from the British monetary grip by withdrawing from the Sterling region.

In 1961, a new Iraqi law was enacted by which the Iraqi State reclaimed most of the concession areas of the foreign oil companies. This provoked Britain and other western states against the government of Abdul Karim Qassim.

The leaders of the coup were divided towards Abdul Nasser. Abdul Salam Aarif was considered loyal to Nasser, so he preferred Iraq join Egypt and Syria in the United Arab Republic. However, Abdul Karim Qassim was against that. When Aarif noticed

his friend Qassim not completely affiliated to Nasser policy, he renounced him and started to look for an opportunity of making coup against him. Qassim then removed him from the government in which he was considered the second person; and he was later on arrested and put to trial.

The situation in Iraq aggravated because Qassim increasingly worked with the communists in Iraq during the last years of his government. This strengthened their position in Iraq and accordingly rallied the agents of America and Britain against him equally. Nasser started to strongly attack him and his communist allies in Iraq, accusing them of being agents to Moscow. He accused them of abandoning Arab Nationalism. Therefore, Nasser supported some revolutionary movements against Qassim, one of which was the movement of colonel Adul Wahhab Shawwaf, but it failed. Ba'th party started also to organise its cadres and prepared for a coup.

The Ba'thists and nationalists united over overthrowing Qassim, and they effectively tried to assassinate him in 1959. Abdul Nasser supported them, where his military attaché in Baghdad, Abdul Majid Farid paid 7000 Egyptian pounds to facilitate the assassination operation, according to the information given by the secretary of Ba'th party at that time, Ali Saleh Sa'di. However the attempt failed.

Political forces continued to rally against Qassim. America, Britain and oil companies that were harmed due to withdrawing their concessions supported them. Matters escalated more, and the Kurds joined the game, so the enemies of Qassim increased and conditions became completely ripe for a new coup.

Then the coup came in 8 February 1963, where Ba'th party and the national forces led by Abdul Salam Aarif and supported by Nasser, conducted a bloody violent coup that led to killing of Qassim and the elamination and torture of communists. Ali Saleh Sa'di, the secretary of Ba'th party said after the coup: "We came to power on an American train". King Hussein of Jordan said in an interview with Mohammad Hasanain Haikal, the former editor of Al-Ahram newspaper: "Allow me to say that what happened in Iraq in 8 February 1963 had enjoyed the support of the CIA". The people of the coup were forces of mixed loyalty to America and to the English. Therefore, it was not expected this coup would continue without one of the two sides overcomes the other".

The coup was arranged of the Ba'thists led by Ali Saleh Sa'di, Mahdi Ammash, Ahmad Hasan al-Bakr and other people loyal to the English, and of the nationalists, led by Abdul Salam Aaarif, Tahir Yahya and others, who were favourite to Abdul Nasser and supported by America.

Later on dispute took place between the partners in the coup, the nationalists and Ba'thists, due to their political views and international loyalties differences regarding the government powers. Abdul Salam Aarif thus removed the Ba'thists from the authority, brought the Nasserites closer, strengthened his grip on the authority, and started to imitate Abdul Nasser in the government styles, curries favour with him and follows his policies. The Ba'thists responded to their removal by trying to make a

coup against Abdul Salam Aarif. So, they started to rally their forces and tried to overthrow him in 1964, but they were exposed. Abdul Nasser immediately sent 600 Egyptian military to Iraq to support the forces of Aarif. This led to the failure of the Ba'athists attempt. Nasserites allying with the nationalists, who were led by Aarif, were rewarded by giving them more posts in the Iraqi government.

In 13 April 1966, Abdul Salam died in a plane crash. So, his brother Abdul Rahman Aarif was appointed as president of Iraq. America played a great role in his appointment; however he was of weak character and not good for politics. Matters in Iraq became unstable after the death of Aarif, and the influence in Iraq fluctuated between the English and American. It finally settled for the advantage of the English by the coup of July 1968, where the Ba'athists loyal to the English led by al-Bakr and his deputy Saddam Hussein took the reign of power.

Ten years after that al-Bakr was forced to concede the authority to Saddam Hussein who managed to rally the Ba'ath forces behind him, and combined security forces in his hand. Thus, matters settled to Saddam after he destroyed all the centres of military forces in the state. Then Saddam started a war against Iran on behalf of the British interests that were harmed by the revolution of al-Khumaini, where the war continued for eight years and destroyed every thing.

In 1990, Saddam waged a new war against Kuwait, where he occupied it in the summer of that year. Britain aimed from that war to be a means of pressure that leads to negotiation over two matters: The first is to promote its agent Saddam, the strong man in the region, which would lead to strengthen its position in the region. The second is acknowledge America's share in the influence and oil in the Gulf. However, America used that incident as an excuse to seize the Gulf, build military bases in it and gain control over its oil and rulers, both the American and the British agents, under the pretext of liberation of Kuwait. Britain attempted to reach a solution through negotiation, but it failed. America, rather considered this the opportunity it prepared for since many years, which is to become the master of the Gulf. When Britain noticed her determination, it joined her in the war for only driving the Iraqi regime from Kuwait rather than destroying it. This is because the war was announced for liberating Kuwait, and they both agreed to that. Thus, the war started, where America led a coalition of thirty foreign and Arab countries to fight against Iraq and drive it out of Kuwait in 1991. America was about to overthrow the regime of Saddam and take over Baghdad had she not observed her agreement with Britain, particularly the declared reason was liberating of Kuwait. Thus, it abstained from destroying the regime. Instead it left it to destroy the uprising of the Shiites and Kurds against his authority. So, when Bush Senior contacted General Schowartscove who was advancing towards Iraq, and asked him to halt and withdraw immediately, the American general was surprised and said: (Sir! There is no any obstacle before us, and within hours we would be in Baghdad and destroy Saddam's regime). Bush answered him saying: (There are matters you do not know; return back immediately). He was alluding to the deal he made with Britain. However, America used later on the presence of Saddam for scaring the gulf by the Iraqi regime, so as to remain their safe refuge. She also used his presence as an excuse to create no flight zones in the

south and north of Iraq, under the pretext of preventing him from making air attacks against his citizens and neighbours.

Thus, she was content with making siege against Iraq instead of overthrowing its regime. The American siege continued under the UN cover till 2003, where the American and British forces swept over Iraq again, occupied it, overthrew the regime of Saddam and controlled the oil of Iraq. Thus, Iraq fell again to direct colonization under the leadership of America, and its ruler became for the first time an American person called Paul Bremer.

War against Iraq was only the first step towards a huge project that was fashioned before the current administration took power. This project was designed in coordination with the military armament and oil companies, besides the forces of the right wing in USA.

It started with thoughts for laying out new foundations for the new American foreign policy in the 21st century. This new American foreign policy aimed at preserving America as the leading state in the world, subjugating the entire world to the American influence, and preventing any state or nation from trying to challenge America or budging her away from the post of leading state in the world; even if this needed unilateral military solutions without the approval of the UN. This policy was first called: “peace through strength”, as it came in a document issued by the Pentagon in 1992, when Dick Cheney was secretary of defence.

Work continued on this project till it was finally formulated in 1997. The founders of this plan were Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney. This project was called in its final form “Project for the New American Century”.

The project came in a document published in September 2000 under the title of “Rebuilding America’s Defences: Strategies, Forces, and Resources for a New Century”. It called for:

Changing the unfavourable regimes, distribution of the American forces in South Europe, South and Centre of Asia and Middle East, controlling the energy resources in the world, militarising the space, and the intention of using nuclear weapons for realising the American goals.

This document, which was disclosed by “Sunday Herald”, pointed out that Bush administration had planned for military control over the gulf since many years, whether there was or not Saddam Hussein in power. The document mentioned: **“The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf”.**

Therefore, the plan for attacking Iraq was ready before. What was needed is only to have the circumstances for its implementation; and thus the events of 11/9/2001 were the required suitable opportunity.

America accordingly started to prepare the environment for executing that even

before occupation of Afghanistan. This preparation went through the following stages:

The most important cause they claimed was Iraq's possession of mass destruction weapons, WMD. Therefore, the talk was at the beginning about the axis of evil; and Iraq, Iran and North Korea were mentioned as players in it. Bush gave in January 2002 a statement in which he described Iraq, Iran and North as axis of evil. Bush added saying: the three states do not seek to possess WMD; they rather intend to give them to the terrorists. Bush said: (Time is not in our advantage. I am not going to wait new events while the threats loom in the horizon. I will not allow to the most dangerous regime in the world to threaten us with the most dangerous weapons in the world).

It was well known the American administration had no intention of military intervention in Iran and North Korea. Colin Powell, in a listening session before the congress two weeks after that speech of Bush about the axis of evil, he said regarding Iran and North Korea; (There is no plan to start war against these two states. We want to start dialogue with these two states. We want to contain North Korea so as to prevent it from distributing weapons, and we will exercise pressure against them. We have no plans to attack North Korea or enter into dispute with Iran).

The most important reason that made Bush Junior add Iran and North Korea to Iraq in the axis of evil was firstly not to show Iraq the only target, for this would be harmful from political and planning aspects. This would indicate the American administration is focusing on Saddam; and thus all sights would be then focused on what would Bush do in Iraq. Bush administration would then be in a difficult position before the American and world public opinion. The second is that if Bush spoke about Iran alone with Iraq, then it would be likely understood it is a new crusade war against Muslims. This would create for Bush troubles in Muslim lands before the war against Iraq starts. Therefore, North Korea was the third ideal state to choose, because it is not Islamic and it is portrayed as enemy to America. Besides, America wanted to preoccupy China and Russia through fuelling the front of North Korea. Thus, the declaration of Bush about the axis of evil prepared the American public opinion to accept a potential war for destroying that axis of evil.

Talk followed about Iraq possession of WMD (weapons of mass destruction) and that it does not hesitate in using them. This is because it used them against its people, besides it coordinates with the terrorists and might deliver to them these weapons. Statements by senior officials in the American administration started to follow in succession about that subject. Condoleeza Rice declared the reason for targeting Saddam is also: (Iraq is an oppressive regime. It is true there are other oppressive regimes in the world, but Iraq is a regime that attacks its neighbour countries. It is an oppressive regime that threatens the American interests and her allies in the region. There is no any other state similar to Iraq regarding the following subjects: Saddam supported the terrorists in the Middle East against our friends, so he gave funds to the suicidal Palestinians, and attempted to assassinate the American president (Bush

Senior during his visit to Kuwait). There is no president in any state similar to Saddam. Saddam was not content in manufacturing WMD, but he also used them. There is no other state in the world that did the same).

Bush administration spoke loudly about WMD of Saddam; and it tried to convince her allies and the American public opinion of that. The period between November 2001 and March 2002 was decisive for taking the decision of launching a war against Iraq. The officials of Bush administration that spoke about WMD depended on the analysis made previously by the UN, the American CIA and the western intelligence agencies. They did not aim at verifying Iraq's possession of WMD; they rather wanted to raise their voice about this subject so that it becomes a pretext for the war, which America prepares the atmosphere for it.

Furthermore, the neo-conservatives who hold the reigns of the American administration feared even the likelihood of WMD existence in Iraq. This is because they considered that as danger and threat to the Jewish state, and accordingly to them, for they viewed Israel as a vital interest to them in the region.

As regarding the possibility of Saddam giving WMD to the terrorists, this was one of the greatest matters discussed in the American administration. Wolfowitz acknowledged that when he said: (We have three worries regarding Saddam regime. Firstly, the WMD; secondly, the regime support to the terrorists; and thirdly, the crimes it committed against the Iraqi people. In reality, there is a fourth more important reason, which is the link between the WMD and terrorism).

Thus, the neo-conservatives started to focus on Saddam's possession of WMD, and the possibility of delivering them secretly to the terrorists for attacking America with them.

Many scenarios were written about this subject. An American official said for example: (The greatest danger that might come from Saddam is his use of Chemical weapons by conventional means, as an example in a bag or a suicidal plane).

Rumsfeld spoke to the congress regarding the relation between Iraq and terrorism, saying: (One of our first aims in war against terrorism is to prevent the replicate of 11 September and confronting America with WMD. It is not necessary here to discuss whether the terrorist threat will come from a terrorist regime or a terrorist group. What matters is to eliminate such threat regardless of its origin. The matter we know is that Iraq possesses at this moment biological and chemical weapons, besides its seeks to obtain nuclear weapons).

Few weeks after the end of attack against Afghanistan, ie after December, Iraq became at the top of the American agenda. America prepared the its domestic atmosphere, and did her best to prepare the possible international atmosphere, under the pretext of Iraq's possession of WMD and its secret delivery to the terrorists.

America added a further objective, which she used to emphasise on frequently. It is the civilization struggle against the Islamic region to promote in it the Western

civilization, so as to replace Islam in the people's minds. The Americans thought they could through this project spread their false values, and lay down the education curricula for moulding the minds of the future generations in the region according to their designs. They started to speak much about freedom, democracy, supporting women (rights) and human rights. They wanted to portray their occupation of Iraq as a way to carry these (shining) values to the region. The project of the (Great Middle East), which they were occupied with since the beginning of 2004, came in that context. They planned to present it to the G8 (Industrial Countries) summit in middle June, and to NATO conference late June. America wanted to make of Iraq a centre for spreading the Western values in the region. Thus they would generate a bad political class that stands an obstacle before the ambition of the Islamic ummah. This ummah yearns to her great Islam and to resume her Islamic way of life by establishing the *Khilafah rashida*. The *Khilafah rashida* became anxiety to the west and particularly America. So, they plan to attack the Khilafah and attack Islam on which it stands, even before it comes to sight.

Thus, America prepared the atmosphere for her attack against Iraq: She wanted to eliminate the WMD, and spread the democratic principles, freedom and the corrupt western values in the region. The war broke out in 19/3/2003, where America occupied Iraq by destroying the official regime in 9/4/2003. The regime was already defeated from within because of its abandonment of the aqeeda of the ummah and its peak, which is jihad. Bush announced the end of the major combat operations in 30/4/2003. America thought she won the war and stabilized after demolishing the official regime. However, she was shocked by the Muslims heroic resistance to the occupation, which surprised her. It is a violent resistance, which the American enemies before others acknowledged its strength. The events in Falluja, Najaf and other Iraqi regions are live examples, which give witness to that. This prompted America to speed up the authority handover, at least symbolically, to the agents of the CIA in Iraq, so as to reduce the military and moral pressure against her. She also tried her best to bring in Iraq some forces from the countries that support her in this war. She even tried to involve the NATO in Iraq as she did in Afghanistan. She decided to make the end of June (2004) the time for the symbolic authority handover, to her agents in Iraq. She thought this would deliver her of the predicament she walked in.

Senior officials in the American state department and Pentagon said before the American Congress in 1/7/2004, regarding their explanation of the authority transfer to the Iraqis that the new interim Iraqi government is expected to assume its tasks in 1/7/2004. This government would not enjoy except 'a limited sovereignty' over the country. It would not have authority over the military forces of the USA and the coalition forces present in Iraq. In a listening session before the committee of arm forces in the American Congress, Paul Wolfowitz, defence minister assistant, and Mark Grossman, deputy of state department said: "USA functions in accordance with the state management of the interim period, which was approved by the Iraqi Governing Council and the resolution issued by the Security Council last October. Both legislations give the American military leaders the task of running the security". Though, the process of transferring the authority to the Iraqi interim government is described as granting of full sovereignty, Grossman described it as 'limited sovereignty', because it is 'limited by the interim law and the UN resolution'.

According to the current plan, the envoy of the UN general secretary, al-Akhdar al-Ibrahimi will supervise the formation of an interim government that runs the Iraqi government institutions for a period of six months. It will then pave the way for electing an interim national assembly in January 2005, which would select a second government and coin a draft of permanent constitution. Wolfowitz described the government of 1st July as ‘completely interim’, and its task is to ‘run the ministries. But that which is more important is to prepare for the elections’. He added, the government will further run the police, ‘but with coordination with the Central American leadership, because this situation is not natural in this aspect’. The republican senator, John Warner directed a question to the head of the Joint Chief of Staffs, General Richard Meyers, saying: “We will then transfer the sovereignty, but the military decisions will remain totally in the hands of the American general; is that true?” Meyers replied saying: “ Yes; this is true”.

Wolfowitz spoke shedding light on the efforts aiming at creating a new big military force there: “Sovereignty is not a matter that might or we want to restore it. Security of Iraq will be part of a multi national force under American leadership, including Iraqi forces”.

The USA warned that the new Iraqi government, which is expected to assume the authority in Iraq on first of July might have to give up some of its functions for the coalition forces.

Colin Powel, the secretary of state said it is necessary the coalition forces continue to undertake their tasks under the American leadership.

Powel had also said in an interview with Reuters: “The Coalition forces must remain under American leadership. This might overstep that which some people call as complete sovereignty”. He added saying: “He hopes these details are worded in the UN resolution”.

Approaching the time of the authority handover, as they called it, to the Iraqis, confrontations between the occupation and the resistance blazed. When the Falluja was under siege, conflicts broke out with the supporters of As-Sadr (al-Mahdi army). The occupation, by request from Bremer himself, asked the intervention of the Iraqi Islamic party, Sunni ‘Ulema Society, and other Shiite parties like Hizb ud-Da’wa and some Shiite religious authorities, like Sastani. This was to mediate for reaching ceasefire between the people of Falluja and supporters of As-Sadr on one side and the occupation on the other side. However, the occupation insisted on its conditions. Despite the presence of ceasefire, the occupation continued to mobilise its forces for besieging Falluja, and they remained persistent on arresting or killing As-Sadr and disbanding his militia of ‘al-Mahdi army’.

Arrival of America to Iraq for its occupation and making of it a passageway and a spring board for starting and continuing its project for the American century, obliges it to form an Iraqi stooge government, unique of its kind. This government would

give America extensive powers and unlimited concessions so that she uses the land of Iraq as a starting point for the creation of the American empire and finalising the project of American century. The statements given by Wolfowitz before the Congress explain this matter, where he said: "Sovereignty is not a matter that might or we want to restore it. Security of Iraq will be part of a multi national force under American leadership, including Iraqi forces".

This is also explains the statements of some American officials who said the USA wants to pursue her operations in Iraq after the handover of authority to the Iraqis in 1st of next July, by signing a security agreement with the Iraqi side.

General Richard Meyers, head of Joint Chief of Staff announced also "that the period of the American military presence in Iraq is still unknown".

He talks about more than 130 thousand soldiers stationed in at least seven military bases inside Iraq.

America tried to increase her barbaric activities against the resistance in Iraq so as to stabilize the matters till the time of the symbolic authority handover to her agents in Iraq. She used various fighting means, but she could not shake the power of the resistance despite her torture to the people. She could not also create security for herself; rather fear and terror overwhelmed her soldiers once they left their tanks. Even inside their tanks they do not enjoy any security or safety. Falluja, the twin city of Jenin gives witness to that and speaks of it, despite the aerial and land strikes America conducted against it.

Later on, the barbaric crimes of America appeared revealing the torture means she used in the Abu Ghraib prison, which reached a degree animals would abstain from doing by their instinct; however America did that. So, she is really like what Allah said:

"كالأنعام، بل هم أضلُّ".

(They are like the animals, rather worse). [TMQ]

Thus, the disreputable civilization of America and her despicable values appeared in their true nature; these civilization and values, which they claimed would liberate Iraq and the entire region.

American aggression against Iraq has exposed America in her true nature, as declined ideologically and intellectually, even militarily. Look at these few young believers who do not count so many in numbers, yet they rubbed America's face in dust. The events have also shown that the huge weapons, which America possesses, are used by fainthearted people who are not good for challenge or bravery. Had not America possessed this huge arsenal of weapons, cowardice of her people would have been exposed the same way her despicable civilization and values were exposed.

Therefore, the symbolic authority handover planned at end of next June will not

deliver them from the quagmire they fell in. Their ambassador, Negrobonti who was appointed in Iraq after 30/6/2004 will not also deliver them, though he was selected for being a leading person in politics and crime.

The choice of John Negrobonti as America's ambassador to Iraq for replacing Bremer comes within the American plan for suppressing the people of Iraq and eliminating all the centres of resistance and opposition to the wicked American projects. Negrobonti had gained wide experience in Honduras - when he worked as an ambassador there – in dealing with those who dissented from the American will. He is known to have been directly implicated in training and equipment of 'regiment 316', known as regiment of death in Honduras. This regiment killed, during Negrobonti service there, about 200 dissidents that opposed the use of Honduras as 'a non immersed planes carrier' during the war. The militia of 'Contra' against Sandinists in Nicaragua waged that war at that time. Negrobonti did not hesitate in making lies under oath during his witness before the Congress regarding his complete knowledge of the happenings in Honduras, and his implication in 'Iran Contra' scandal. He acknowledged transferring American aid assigned to Honduras to the Contra, a matter that disagrees with the American law. This violation was naturally enough to remove him from any high post. However, they considered his crimes record preferable to his violation, which qualified him to become the ambassador and the absolute master in Iraq.

In order to silence any condemnation to Negrobonti in Honduras, Bush administration– after nominating him to a post of delegate in the UN – removed some people of 'regiment 316' from the USA. This included the regiment's founder General Loise Alonso Discowa Alivira, who assumed the post of deputy to the ambassador of Honduras in Washington. This general had later on revealed many of the facts about the American support to the regiment.

This is the ambassador of USA she intends to appoint in Iraq after the symbolic authority handover, so as to replace Bremer in governing Iraq. Thus he would become the true governor of Iraq, and nominally an ambassador of the USA.

After understanding the reality of this man, it is possible to imagine the crimes, which he will commit in Iraq if the future of Iraq remained, Allah forbidding, the way they plan for it.

.....

It is unlikely to have a change in the American policy if Kerri won the coming presidential elections in 4/11/2004. This is due to the political facts that are dictated and will be still dictated on the world. So this would limit the options available to the winner regarding the international policies. John Holsman, an analyst in the conservative institution of Heritage said: "The difference between the two (candidates) regarding the war against terrorism is very much less than most people think. There might be a difference in the degree of harshness, but not in the general essence". Other foreign analysts and diplomats say: "Despite the difference in methodology, the political facts, such as escalating violence in Iraq, the continuous

attacks of the extremists worldwide, the limited resources, the structure of the Congress and the internal public opinion; these will dictate the policies of Bush or Kerri”.

Moreover, the activities adopted by the current administration will naturally impose specific matters on the coming administration. Steven Hiss, the expert in presidential policies in Brookings Institute has pointed to this by saying: “The government and the world are inside a lift; so you cannot simply stop and say, I think I have to leave here”.

A former official in Bush administration said to Reuters: “Kerri might wage a more effective war against terrorism, than Bush. This is because he might follow a more complicated approach due to large-scale treats. He might merge between the military power and soft power, such as building coalition, and struggle to winning hearts and minds”.

This is the American position that planned the aggression against Iraq, and determined the phases of this aggression for realizing America’s objectives in Iraq, and for using it as a basis and a spring board to the entire region.

In order to have a complete picture, we will mention the European position, particularly the French, Russian and English:

European and Russian Position:

The French president, Chirac warned strongly, in a press conference held in Alezyee in 29/4/2004, of symbolic authority handover and of using the Security Council for issuing a new resolution that leaves the authorities in the hands of the coalition. He considered this to be “catastrophic”. Chirac said: “It is urgent today to handover the authority to the Iraqis. However, the question is to know how this will be done”. He said: “It is my conviction there is no feasible way-out from the current situation in Iraq for proceeding to rebuild Iraq without true transfer of authority under the real supervision of the UN”. He continued to say: “It will be catastrophic to have a solution based on ambiguous settlement, where it will be said: Look, the UN exists in Iraq, it provides the international cover, while in reality things did not change and the coalition continues to hold the true authorities”. The French president referred to the suggestions proposed by al-Akhdar al-Ibrahimi, whom he had met in Paris, saying: “These suggestions would lead to presenting a resolution draft in the SC”, which the USA is working on it. However, he commented saying: “Are these suggestions leading to a clear and strong international resolution, which will be approved in the SC and become the basis for rebuilding Iraq politically, economically and socially? I am not sure of that”. Chirac had also called upon the EU to strongly support the suggestions of al-Ibrahimi and to “speak with one voice”. But, because of the known differences between the EU members, he expressed his suspicion that Europe would achieve this aim. The declarations of the French president reflect the fears of Paris of ‘wasting’ the opportunity represented in the due rights of next June 30th, and of Washington’s rejection to benefit from this occasion ‘because she follows another policy’, as it was expressed by a French source. Paris works with Madrid and Berlin for crystallizing a ‘joint course’. In this context, Chirac received the Spanish Prime Minister, Khosee Rodrigiz Thabatro, who reached Paris in his way from Berlin, where he made extensive consultations with Councillor Girhard Shroeder about the situation in Iraq.

France wants the SC to adopt a resolution that clearly confirms the handover of sovereignty to the Iraqis, and confirms the capability of the Iraqi government that results from the elections of 2005 in asking the forces of the ‘coalition’ to leave the country.

An informed French source explained the position of his country regarding the content of the new resolution of the SC, which is supposed to define a course that leads to elections. He clarified France wants the resolution to emphasise the Iraqi sovereignty is ‘real’, and the handover of authority would be ‘genuine and complete’ at the end of next June.

The source said: “France wants to verify this sovereignty ‘through actions on the ground’, particularly in connection with the Iraqis’ management of their resources by themselves”. He added: “The second matter that Paris wants is that the Iraqi government, which will be formed after 1st July, is entitled to examine the activities of the multi national forces. It insists the Iraqi military forces must not be annexed to the American forces. He confirmed his country insists on including this in the wording of the SC resolution; indicating this represents a limit”.

He pointed out France wants, after running the elections that result in a ‘sovereign and legitimate’ Iraqi government, that this government has the right at any time to ask the departure or continuance of the foreign forces. ‘The important matter is that it has the choice to clearly express its wish’.

He continued to say France does not want the new resolution to have any point about ‘review’ of the conditions at a particular (future) date. This is because SC has no right to decide the date of this review for adjudicating the issue of withdrawal, which is entrusted to the Iraqis and the Iraqi government resulting from the elections. He added: “In case France did not obtain such confirmation within the framework of the new resolution, it will abstain from voting without using the Veto”.

The source confirmed there are European countries, like Germany and Spain that support the Russian position, which differs little. Moscow envisages two resolutions: The first is for approving the formation of the new government, while the second is to emphasise the importance of accepting the demands of this government. Voting will then take place in the SC over these demands so as to decide the authority and size of sovereignty given to the government. He said France prefers issuing one resolution, besides ‘clear commitment of the return of sovereignty’.

It is clear France and Russia endeavour, through exploiting the conditions in Iraq, to obtain the support of Europe for generating a change in the American international policy. This is because they are aware of the American plans for the period that comes after Iraq, and that America wants to make the entire world an American ranch. This would put France and Russia and the rest of Europe at America’s mercy for many decades. She does not want to permit any international role to France and Europe, not even to maintain their interests in the world. Therefore, they will try to obstruct the symbolic authority handover to Iraq through using an international resolution that gives legitimacy to the presence of America in Iraq for decades to come. This would enable her bringing in Iraq forces from Arab and non-Arab countries so as to join the coalition forces in Iraq, and thus leave America free to engage in her other military tasks in the world. Therefore, European countries and Russia will try to prevent using the UN for serving American interests in Iraq.

Europe has a long road to go before it can speak in one voice, a matter, which Chirac pointed to when he expressed his doubt about Europe’s capability to realize this aim. However, France will try through Europe to frustrate the American plans in Iraq so as

to prevent America from proceeding in its plans for building the American empire and finalizing the project of American century. It will try to do this in defence of its interests. However, this does not mean France, Russia or any state in the world wants America to completely fail and withdraw from Iraq, thus leaving it free of any western influence. They would not like to see Muslims in Iraq restore their authority without being controlled by a bunch of western agents. This would cause more harm to their interests than leaving America complete its plans. The worst thing crusader Europe fears, as well as all the evil forces in the world is that America leaves Iraq free from the grip of a bunch of Western agents. This is because Europe, contrary to America, is close to the Islamic world. Europe tasted the acrimony of war with Muslims. It is aware what the liberation of Muslims from the noose of the disbelievers means. This is particularly if that became a beginning to the liberation of the entire Islamic world from the noose of the crusader disbelievers in the Middle East.

British Position:

As for Britain, it still follows its usual course since it retreated from influencing the international events and controlling its own plans and designs. Since then, it did not leave the American wagon move without joining it, even if it had to ride a second-class carriage. It struggles to protect its interests in the colonies of its perishing empire, and tries to obstruct the American plans, wherever it is possible. It tried to do that in Iraq, and is still trying. It aspires to have a share with America, regardless of its size, and to be within the picture of the events as a co-player with the leading state, even if its role was according to America's plans. However, it never missed seizing any opportunity to disturb her plans. It did that before the war was waged against Iraq when it coerced America to resort to the SC, seeking the issuance of a resolution that permits her aggression. Britain knew at that time SC would not agree because it was aware of the effective countries in the SC. Thus America would then wage the war without having an international resolution, and appear violating the international law. Despite America would not bother for that, Britain considered that enough. Therefore, on one side Britain complied with America, but on other side it agreed with Europe in frustrating America and foiling her plans. It does this in accordance with its own way, ie without open challenge. Thus, it complies with America without dissociating itself from Europe, following the policy of: (a foot in America and another in Europe).

The policy currently followed by the American president, Bush, towards Iraq comes within the frame of the long term American plan. The strategist designers of the American policy for controlling the Gulf laid down this plan. The former American president, Nixon started effectively the implementation of this plan in 1970. This came after the government of the British Prime Minister, Harold Wilson decided on the 1st of January 1968 to withdraw from its colonies east of Suez Canal, including the Gulf, by the end of 1970. Nixon and all the American presidents who came after him started to implement this plan according to the available conditions and within a project whose execution requires some decades.

The events of 11/9/2001 provided Bush Junior with the appropriate condition to attack and occupy Iraq. Besides controlling its oil after she controlled the oil of most of the Gulf States, America does not want Iraq to become again a strong and coherent state. She rather wants it to be made of impotent linked parts so as to control it easily. She wants as well to fulfil to the Kurds her promises to them when they were opponents to Saddam, by having a strong position in Kurdistan of Iraq similar to an entity.

America endeavoured since World War I to create an entity to the Kurds. After the emergence of the Kurds issue as a result of the settlements of World War I and fragmentation of the Ottoman State, the American president, Wilson called in Versailles Conference to grant the Kurds right to self-determination. However, Britain that was the leading state at that time, ignored this American wish, and divided the territories of Kurds between Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria to please its stooge at that time, Mustafa Kamal.

America used to always support the Kurdish separatist movements in North Iraq despite the loyalty of these movements to Britain. This is because America preferred the absence of a single strong state in Iraq. She took this matter as her strategy since it abandoned its isolation. When Abdul Karim Qassim assumed authority by her support, she proposed to him making Iraq a federal state made of three parts. After the second Gulf war, America seized the opportunity of the siege on Iraq, so she sanctified the presence of the safe areas (no flight zones) to fragment Iraq and to pave the way for establishing a Kurdish state. Therefore, America made conciliation between the fighting Kurdish groups, and sought to build a Kurdish ruling entity for them, particularly the conciliation between the main two Kurdish parties: The Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP), led by Barzani, and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK), led by Talbani. America tried to convince Turkey with the idea, and she sent delegates to the Congress for this purpose. Then she supervised the elections process in the Kurdish areas for establishing state institution there, including a parliament.

Graham Fowler, the deputy of the former head of American Intelligence Council of Iraq affairs, said in August 1996: "Iraq must be divided into three parts. America insists on her plan for creating a Kurdish state". Richard Holbrook, assistant of former secretary of state, who was sent by his government to Turkey for convincing it with the American idea, said to the Turkish president, Dimiril in 5/9/1995: "The best solution for Iraq is the federal one". Dimiril replied by saying: "Federalism means division, which will hurt Turkey".

Britain however strongly opposes the division. Douglas Hog, State minister of British foreign affairs said: "Our clear policy towards Iraq is based on no support or encourage to any attempt that aims to creating an independent Kurdish state inside Iraq, within its international borders. We believe Iraq must remain a united state, and, by all of our efforts, we oppose its division. We believe that creating a region to the Kurds in Iraq, which enjoys autonomy, can solve their issue there. We agree with the Turks over this subject; and if we disagree with the government of Saddam, this does not mean we desire in dividing Iraq".

The interests of Turkey and other neighbour countries make them agree with the British policy that aims at preventing the division of Iraq. Secretary of Turkish foreign ministry said: “It is wrong to define North Iraq as Kurdish area, for it has 300 thousand Turkmen”.

America tries through Bremer and her stooge, ‘Iraqi Governing Council’ to take in consideration the special situation of the Kurds by preparing the fragmentation of Iraq into impotent entities under the name of union or federalism. America had already promised the Kurds (when they were in opposition outside Iraq at the time of Saddam) of large racial federalism that includes Karkook, which becomes a nucleus for an independent state. Therefore, when Saddam was removed, the Kurds tried to undertake practical measures for implementing this promise and for annexing Karkook to the autonomy area, which existed at the time of Saddam. However, America faced, after occupation of Iraq, opposition from her other agents regarding Karkook. Therefore, it was content by only strengthening the former autonomy area. So, she gave it effective authorities, and stipulated that in the constitution coined by the ‘Governing Council’, in compliance with the wishes of America. Thus, the article number 53 in the Iraqi constitution coined by Bremer and approved by his stooge ‘Governing Council’ state in paragraph (a): “The government of Kurdistan is recognised as the official government of the territories that were run by the government mentioned in 19/3/2003”. The term of ‘Government of Kurdistan’ that came in the law means the Kurdish National Assembly, Kurdistan cabinet of ministers, and the local judiciary authority in the province of Kurdistan. This means it is a state inside the state. Article number 54, paragraph (b) stated: “Regarding the application of the federal laws in the Province of Kurdistan, the Kurdish National Assembly is allowed to adjust the implementation of any of these (federal) laws inside the region of Kurdistan”. If this were not separation, what it would be then?

This is the criminal constitution that was written under the guns of occupation. The sincere sons of Iraq must address this constitution before it is too late, and they have to abrogate it. They have abrogated before (al-Yasiq) that was coined by Tartars after they swept over Baghdad and burnt every thing and threw millions of the Islamic culture transcripts in Tigris River. If they did not rush to abrogate it, then Iraq might be torn up into fighting impotent states. It will then become breeding ground for corruption, and market for promoting every deviant thought, and every abominable and odd opinion and thought of disbelief.

Muslims in Iraq will never despair and nor surrender. They are part of a deep-rooted nation, the Islamic ummah that reigned over the dunya for many centuries. The American and British occupation will vanish, sooner or later. The Islamic ummah worldwide is about to set out for liberating herself of the yoke of the new American colonialism, its oppressive and disbelief laws, and its criminal authority. By these laws, the division of the ummah was sanctioned, and her might was proscribed and her honour was disgraced. Thus, America’s inhumanity was openly exposed in killing the Muslims in Falluja, Karbalaa, Ba’qooba, Baghdad and Najaf. The evil smell of the oppressive colonialist’ civilization appeared in its ugly treatment to the Iraqi prisoners in the prison of Abu Ghraib. That ghastly horrible treatment alarms the hearts, and tongues feel ashamed to describe. The repugnant smell of this barbarian

civilization has spread everywhere at a time the American media clamour and fill space by talking about promised democracy and freedom.

Iraq was afflicted, since the fall of the Ottoman Islamic State, with stooge, misguided and corrupt rulers. They are some of its disrespectful sons who were imposed over the heads of the Iraqis by the unbeliever colonialists. Since the moment the filthy feet of the British touched the land of Iraq during World War I, Muslims in Iraq have been groaning and suffering under the oppression of these wicked, traitor and slave rulers, stooge to Britain and America. They have pushed Iraq in the fire of the British and American struggle over interests in the region. They have spread terror all over Iraq due to the hectic struggle between their national, communist, Nasserite and Ba'th movements over authority. This bitter struggle over authority destroyed the state and changed it into ruin. They already caused havoc in it, and shed a lot of blood, and finally they returned Iraq again to direct colonialism, after this long bloody journey. So, the outcome of 80 years of government by these stooge rulers is simply: ruin, destruction, killing, torture, and tribulations, and then the return again of direct colonilization.

This is the outcome and this is the harvest. The ummah must properly comprehend this bitter and difficult experiment of Iraq's history, and understand its danger. We should not pass by it as if nothing had happened. The lesson we learn from this experiment is represented in creating a complete and absolute conviction that the national, Ba'th, communist, Arab and Nasserite movements have utterly failed. We should not then rely on such and like movements and parties that adopt such ideas. We must rather believe the loyalty of these movements to the foreigner is not only political, but intellectual as well. Once this conviction existed in the ummah, the path she has to follow for revival must only be return to Islam, and its pure source. There is no way for proper return to Islam except through its political sense, which dictates the establishment of the Islamic State, the Khilafah State. This state alone can deliver Muslims in Iraq and in the entire Islamic countries from the unbeliever colonialists, agents, tyrants and hypocrites.

APPENDIX

During the preparation of this book for printing, some matters happened regarding the subjects that were under discussion in the book:

- 1) The Sudanese government and the rebels of the South signed the treaty of (Nivasha), on Thursday night 27/5/2004. The treaty consists of three framework agreements related to division of legislative and executive authority between the government, the rebels and some political powers. This is related to the centre, South regions, South of Blue Nile and Nuba Mountains. The agreements stipulated as well giving autonomy Ebyi followed by a referendum

- to decide its subordination to the North or the South.
- 2) The Security Council issued resolution number 1546 on 8/6/2004 that gives legitimacy to America's forces in Iraq and to its control. It also opens the door for Arab and non-Arab states to join the occupation forces in Iraq under the pretext of the SC permission. The forces in Iraq would be called multi national forces, led by America, instead of their previous real name of American occupation forces.
 - 3) The leaders of the G8 industrial countries: USA, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Canada, Japan and Russia met on 8/6/2004 in Sea Island opposite state of Georgia (of USA). The meetings continued for three days (8-10)/6/2004. The Great Middle East Project prepared by America was presented in the meeting and approved after inserting some insignificant adjustments in it.
 - 4) The authority was symbolically handed over by Bremer to an interim Iraqi government on Monday 28.6/2004. It included Ghazi Alyawir, as president of the republic (symbolic post), and Iyad Allawi, the agent of the CIA, as Prime Minister (executive post).

Authority handover took place during a short meeting and without a major celebration as they promised before. This is because they were afraid of the resistance for the safety of the attendance. This is despite the strict guard on land and in air. This means the master Bremer, his followers and the interim government are unable to have security for themselves; how then they will provide security for others?

Our last Du'aa is to raise Praise to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds.

BOOK CONTENTS